



po o. ange. 9 - 4

Pe¹⁰ 2788

B. Langb. 104

W O R
J O H N M I L L E R

Historical Journal, and other

Notes and Observations, taken during a tour in the North of England, and into Scotland, in the year 1789.

J O H N M I L L E R
P R I N T E D BY J. JOHNSON, ST. PAULS CHURCH-YARD.
L O N D O N.

1790.

L O N D O N.
Printed by J. JOHNSON, ST. PAULS CHURCH-YARD.



J. Richardson delin.

G. Vertue Sculpsit

THE
WORKS
OF
JOHN MILTON,

Historical, Political, and Miscellaneous.

Now more correctly printed from the ORIGINALS, than in any former Edition,
and many Passages restored, which have been hitherto omitted.

To which is prefixed,

A N A C C O U N T
OF HIS
L I F E A N D W R I T I N G S.
IN TWO VOLUMES.
VOL. I.

L O N D O N :

Printed for A. MILLAR, in the STRAND.

MDCCLIII.

GOVERNMENT

OF THE

WEST INDIES

JOHN MILLAR

Historical, Political, and Miscellaneous

BIBLIOTHECA
REGIA
MONACENSIS

AND

OF HIS

LIFE AND WRITINGS

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I

LONDON: Printed for A. MILLAR, in the Strand, 1781.

MDCCLXXXI

C O N T E N T S

O F T H E

F I R S T V O L U M E.

A N Account of the Life and Writings of Mr. John Milton, by T. Birch, A. M. and F. R. S.	Page 1
Of Reformation touching Church Discipline in England, and the Causes that hitherto have hindered it: In two Books, written to a Friend.	ibid.
Of Prelatical Episcopacy, and whether it may be deduced from the Apostolical Times, by virtue of those Testimonies which are alledged to that purpose in some late treatises; one whereof goes under the name of James Archbishop of Armagh.	32
The Reason of Church Government urged against Prelacy. In two Books.	41
Animadversions upon the Remonstrant's Defence against Smectymnuus.	80
An Apology for Smectymnuus.	109
Of Education; to Master Samuel Hartlib.	142
AREOPAGITICA; a Speech for the Liberty of unlicensed Printing, to the Parlia- ment of England.	141
The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce restored to the good of both Sexes, from the Bondage of Canon Law, and other Mistakes, to the true meaning of Scrip- ture in the Law and Gospel, compared, &c.	173
The Judgment of Martin Bucer concerning Divorce: Written to Edward the Sixth, in his second Book of the Kingdom of Christ, &c.	232
TETRACHORDON: Expositions upon the four chief Places in Scripture which treat of Marriage, or Nullities in Marriage, &c.	258
COLASTERION: A Reply to a nameless Answer against the Doctrine and Disci- pline of Divorce: Wherein the trivial Author of that Answer is discovered, the Licenser conferred with, and the Opinion which they traduce, de- fended.	325
The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates: Proving that it is lawful, and hath been held so through all Ages, for any who have the Power, to call to account a Tyrant or wicked King, and after due Conviction, to depose, and put him to death, if the ordinary Magistrate have neglected, or denied to do it, &c.	341
Observations on the Articles of Peace between James Earl of Ormond, for King Charles the First, on the one hand, and the Irish Rebels and Papists on the other hand: And on a Letter sent by Ormond to Colonel Jones, Governor of Dublin;	

CONTENTS OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

Dublin; and a Representation of the Scots Presbytery at Belfast in Ireland. To which the said Articles, Letter, with Colonel Jones's Answer to it, and Representation, &c. are prefixed.	364
EIKONOCLASTES: In answer to a Book, intituled, Eikon Basilike: The Portraiture of his sacred Majesty in his Solitude and Sufferings.	401
A Defence of the People of England, in answer to Salmasius's Defence of the King.	489
A Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes: Shewing that it is not lawful for any Power on Earth to compel in Matters of Religion.	599
Considerations touching the likeliest means to remove Hirelings out of the Church, &c.	614
The present Means and brief Delineation of a Free Commonwealth; easy to be put in practice, and without delay. In a Letter to General Monk. Published from the Manuscript.	640
The ready and easy Way to establish a Free Commonwealth; and the Excellencies thereof, compared with the Inconveniencies and Dangers of re-admitting Kings in this Nation.	642
Brief Notes upon a late Sermon, intituled, "The Fear of God and the King," preached and since published by Matthew Griffith, D. D. and Chaplain to the late King, wherein many notorious Wrestings of Scripture, and other Falsties, are observed.	653
Accedence commenced Grammar: Supplied with sufficient Rules for the Use of such as, younger or elder, are desirous, without more trouble than needs, to attain the Latin Tongue; the Elder Sort especially with little Teaching, and their own Industry.	663

AN
Historical and Critical Account
OF THE
L I F E and W R I T I N G S
OF
Mr. J O H N M I L T O N.

By THOMAS BIRCH, M. A. and Secretary
of the ROYAL SOCIETY.

First Published in 1738, and now enlarged and improved in
this Second Edition.

MR. John Milton was descended of an ancient family of that name at Milton near Abington in Oxfordshire, where it had been a long time seated, as appears from the monuments still to be seen in the church of Milton, till one of the family having taken the unfortunate side in the contests between the houses of York and Lancaster, was sequestered of all his estate, except what he held by his wife. Our author's grandfather, whose name was John Milton, was under-ranger or keeper of the forest of Shotover near Halton in Oxfordshire^b. He being a zealous papist, disinherited his son, Mr. John Milton, our author's father, on account of his embracing the protestant religion, when he was young; which obliged the latter to retire to London, where he applied himself to the business of a scrivener, by the advice of an intimate friend of his, who was eminent in that profession; and by his diligence and œconomy gained a competent estate^c. He was a man of good taste in music, in which he made so considerable a progress, that he is said to have composed an "In Nomine" of forty Parts; for which he was rewarded with a gold medal and chain by a Polish prince, to whom he presented it. However, this is certain, that for several songs of his composition, after the way of those times, three or four of which are still to be seen in old Wilby's Set of Airs, besides some compositions of his in Ravenscroft's Psalms, he gained the reputation of a considerable master in this science^d. His son compliments him upon this head in one of his Latin poems, intitled, "Ad Patrem," in which he justifies himself for indulging his own inclination to the study of poetry.

^a Life of Mr. John Milton, p. 4, prefixed to the English translation of his "Letters of State," Edit. London 1694. This life was written by his nephew Mr. Edward Philips, as appears from a note in the Copy, which I make use of, which was given by him to a friend of his. ^b Wood, Fasti. Oxon. Vol. I. Col. 262. 2d Edit. London 1721. in fol. ^c Philips, ubi supra. p. 3, 4, 5, ^d Id. p. 4, 5.

Nec tu perge, precor, sacras contemnere musas,
 Nec vanas inopesque puta, quarum ipse peritus
 Munere, mille sonos numeros componis ad aptos,
 Millibus & vocem modulis variare canoram
 Doctus, Arionii merito sis nominis hæres.
 Nunc tibi quid mirum, si me genuisse Poetam
 Contigerit, charo si tam propè sanguine juncti
 Cognatas artes studiumque affine sequamur?
 Ipse volens Phœbus se dispertire duobus,
 Altera dona mihi, dedit altera dona Parenti,
 Dividuumque Deum Genitorque Puerque tenemus.

He married Sarah, of the Family of the Castons, originally derived from Wales, as Mr. Philips tells us^a; but Mr. Wood^b asserts, that she was "of the ancient Family of the Bradshaws;" and a still later account informs us, that she was a Haughton, of Haughton-Tower in Lancashire, as appeared by her own arms, which, with those of her husband, painted upon a board, were not many years ago in possession of our poet's widow in Cheshire^c. She was a woman of incomparable virtue and goodness^d and eminent for her charity^e; and by her Mr. Milton had two sons and one daughter. The eldest son was JOHN, the subject of the present history; the younger CHRISTOPHER, who being designed for the study of the common law of England, was entered young a student of the Inner Temple, of which house he lived to be an ancient bencher, and kept close to that study and profession all his life-time, except during the civil wars in England; when he adhered to the royal cause, and became obnoxious to the parliament by acting to the utmost of his power against them, so long as he kept his station at Reading in Berkshire; and therefore as soon as that town was taken by the parliament forces, he was obliged to quit his house there, and steered his course according to the motion of the king's army. When the war was ended, and his composition made through his brother's interest with the then prevailing powers, he betook himself again to his former study and profession, following chamber-practice every term; yet came to no advancement in a long time, except a small employment in the town of Ipswich, where and near it he spent all the latter time of his life. In the beginning of the reign of king James II. he was recommended by some persons of quality to his Majesty; and at a call of six serjeants received the coif, and the same day was sworn one of the barons of the Exchequer^f and knighted^g; and soon after made one of the judges of the common pleas. But his years and indisposition rendering him unable to bear the fatigue of public employment, he continued not long in either of those stations; but obtaining his Quiet^h, retired to a country life, his study, and devotionⁱ. Mr. Toland tells us^j, that Sir Christopher was "of a very superstitious nature, and a man of no parts or ability;" and that king James II. "wanting a set of judges, that would declare his will to be superior to our legal constitution," appointed him one of the barons of the Exchequer. But Mr. Philips^k represents him as "a person of a modest quiet temper, preferring justice and virtue before all worldly pleasure or grandeur;" and assures us, that he was recommended to that king by some persons of quality, "for his known integrity and ability in the law." ANNE, the only daughter of Mr. John Milton the elder, had a considerable

^a P. 5. See likewise Toland's life of Milton, p. 6. prefixed to Milton's historical, political, and miscellaneous works, Edit. Amsterdam [i. e. London] 1693, in fol. ^b Ubi supra. ^c Letter of Roger Comberbach of Chester, Esq; to William Cowper, Esq; Clerk of the Parliament, in Mr. Francis Peck's New memoirs of Mr. John Milton, p. 1. Edit. London, 1740. in 4to. ^d Philips, p. 6. ^e Joh. Miltoni Defensio secunda, p. 80, 81. Edit. London 1654. ^f Philips p. 5, 6, 7. ^g Toland, ubi supra, ^h Philips p. 7. ⁱ P. 6. ^j P. 6.

portion given her by her father, in marriage with Mr. Edward Philips, son of Mr. Edward Philips of Shrewsbury, who coming up to London young, was entered into the Crown-Office in Chancery, and at length became secondary of that office under Mr. Bembo. By him she had, besides other children, who died infants, two sons, John and Edward. She married for her second husband Mr. Thomas Agar, who, upon the death of his intimate friend Mr. Philips, succeeded him in his place, which he held for many years, and left to Mr. Thomas Milton, Son of Sir Christopher. He had by Mr. Philips's widow two daughters, Mary, who died very young, and Anne, who was living in the year 1694^a.

But to return to our author, Mr. John Milton; he was born in his father's house at the sign of the Spread-Eagle in Bread-street within the city of London, December 9th, 1608^b. Mr. Philips^c and Mr. Toland^d place his birth in 1606, but erroneously; for in a picture of him in the collection of Charles Stanhope, Esq; who procured it from the executors of the widow of Milton, the inscription makes his age to be ten at the painting of it in 1618; and we find by the inscription under his effigies prefixed to his *Logic*, that in 1671 he was sixty-three years of age; and the very cut of him before the edition of his "*Historical, Political, and miscellaneous Works*," to which Toland's life of him is prefixed, informs us, that he was born in 1608. He appears to have had a domestic tutor from the fourth elegy among his Latin poems, written in the eighteenth year of his age, to Mr. Thomas Young, pastor of the English company of merchants at Hamburg, in which he styles Mr. Young his master. He was sent likewise, with his brother to St. Paul's school, of which Mr. ^e Alexander Gill the elder was then master, to whose son, Dr. Alexander Gill, and not to the father, as Mr. Toland mistakes, some of his "*familiar Letters*" are written. While he was at this school he made an uncommon progress by his admirable genius and indefatigable application; for from his twelfth year he generally sat up half the night, as well in voluntary improvements, as in the perfecting of his school-exercises; and this, with his frequent head-achs, was the first ruin of his eyes^f. Mr. Wood^g and Mr. Toland^h assert, that he was sent to the university of Cambridge at fifteen years of age. But this is a gross mistake; for it was not till his seventeenth year, that he was entered there, as is evident from the register of Christ's-College, into which he was admitted Pensionarius minor, on the 12th of February 1624-5 under the tuition of Mr. William Chappel, then fellow of that College, afterwards provost of Trinity-College in Dublin, and dean of Cassels, and at last, bishop of Cork and Ross in Ireland; a divine highly distinguished for his politeness and extensive learning, and to whom, among others, the celebrated treatise of "*the whole Duty of Man*," has been imputed. Milton had already given proofs of his early genius for poetry; for at fifteen years of age he translated the 114th and 136th Psalms into English verse. In his sixteenth year he wrote a Latin ode upon the death of the vice-chancellor of the university; and in his seventeenth year, a copy of English verses on the death of his sister's child, who died of a cough; and a Latin elegy on the death of the bishop of Winchester, and another on that of the bishop of Ely. It was then also, that he composed his fine Latin poem on the Gunpowder-Treason; concerning which, and the rest of his juvenile poems, Morhof in his *Polyhistor* declares, that they shew Milton to have been a man in his childhood, and are vastly superior to the ordinary capacity of that age. In his nineteenth year he wrote the seventh of his Latin elegies upon his falling in love for the first time with a lady, whom he met upon some walks near London, but lost sight of her, and never knew who she was, nor saw her more; but resolved that love should thenceforth give him no farther trouble. In 1628 he took the degree of bachelor of arts, ⁱ having performed his academical exer-

^a P. 6. ^b Philips, p. 7.
p. 6. erroneously styles him Doctor,
the present Edit. and Philips, p. 8.

^c Wood, ubi supra.

^d P. 3.

^e P. 6.

^f Mr. Toland,

^g Miltoni Defensio secunda p. 82 Edit. 1654. Vol. II p. 1. of

^h Col. 262.

ⁱ P. 6.

^k From the University Register.

cises with great applause, some of which are still extant among his works; and he was prevailed to print his verses upon some philosophical questions, and sent them to his friend Mr. Gill the younger, who was eminent likewise for his poetical talents, accompanying them with a Latin letter dated from Cambridge July 2. 1628, in which he complains with high indignation of the ill state of learning there at that time, and represents most of those, who were designed for the profession of divinity, as destitute of all knowledge, both of philology and philosophy, which gave too just apprehensions, lest the monkish ignorance of the former age might again possess the clergy. In 1629, he wrote an excellent ode "on the Morning of Christ's Nativity;" and in 1630 his verses on Shakespear, which were printed with the poems of that author at London in 1640. In the twenty-third year of his age he wrote a letter to a friend of his, who importuned him to enter into some profession. There are two draughts of this letter in his own hand-writing among his manuscripts in Trinity-College library at Cambridge, the first of which draughts is as follows.

" SIR,

" Besides that in sundry respects I must acknowledge me to profit by you, whenever we meet, you are often, and were yesterday especially, to me as a good watchman to admonish, that the howres of the night pass on, (for so I call my life as yet obscure and unserviceable to mankind,) and that the day is at hand, wherein Christ commands all to labour while there is light. Which because I am persuaded you doe to no other purpose, than out of a true desire, that God should be honoured in every one, I am ever readie, you know, when occasion is, to give you account, as I ought, though unaskt, of my tardie moving according to the præcept of my conscience, which I firmly trust is not without God. Yet now I will not streine for any set apologie, but only referre myself to what my mynd shall have at any tyme to declare herself at her best ease. Yet if you think, as you said, that too much love of learning is in fault, and that I have given up my selfe to dreame away my years in the arms of a studious retirement, like Endymion with the moon on Latmus hill; yet consider, that if it were no more but this, to overcome this, there is on the other side both ill more bewitchful to entice away, and natural years more swaying, and good more availeable to withdraw to that you wish me; as first, all the fond hopes, which forward youth and vanitie are fledge with; none of which can sort with this Pluto's helmet, as Homer calls it, of obscurity, and would soon cause me to throw it off, if there were nothing else in't but an affected and fruitlesse curiosity of knowing. And then a naturall desire of honour and renown, which I think, possesses the brest of every scholar, as well as of him that shall, as of him that never shall obtaine it (if this be altogether bad,) which would quickly overway this flegme and melancholy of bashfulnesse, or that other humor; and prævaile with me to præferre a life, that had at least some credit in it, some place given it, before a manner of living much disregarded and discountenanc't. There is besides this, as all well know, about this tyme of a man's life, a strong inclination, be it good or no, to build up a house and family of his owne in the best manner he may; to which nothing is more helpful then the early entring into some credible employment, and nothing more crosse then my way, which my wasting youth would præsently bethinke her of, and kill one love with another, if that were all. But what delight, or what peculiar conceit, may you in charitie thinke, could hold out against the long knowledge of a contrarie command from above, and the terrible seasure of him, that hid his talent? Therefore committ grace to grace, or nature to nature, there will be found on the other way more obvious temptations to bad, as gaine, præferment, ambition, more winning præsentments of good, and more prone affections of nature to encline and dispose, not counting outward causes, as expectations and murmurs of friends, scandals

of Mr. JOHN MILTON.

V

scandals taken, and such-like, then the bare love of notions could resist, So that if it be that which you suppose, it had by this bin round about begirt and over-mastered, whether it had proceeded from virtue, vice, or nature in me. Yet that you may see, that I am som tyme suspicious of myself, and do take notice of a certain belatedness in me, I am the bolder to send you some of my night-ward thoughts some while since, since they come in fitly, in a Petrarchian stanza.

How soon hath time, the futtle theefe of youth,
 Stolne on his wing my three and twentieth yeere!
 My hasting days fly on with full careere;
 But my late spring no bud or blossom shew'th.
 Perhaps my semblance might deceive the truth,
 That I to manhood am arriv'd so neere,
 And inward ripenesse doth much lesse appear,
 That some more tymely-happie spirits indu'th.
 Yet be it lesse or more, or soone or slow,
 It shall be still in strictest measure even
 To that same lot, however meane or high,
 Towards which tyme leads me, and the will of Heaven.
 All is, if I have grace to use it so,
 As ever in my great task-maister's eye."

The last draught is as follows.

" SIR,

Besides that in fundry other respects I must acknowledge me to proffit by you, whenever wee meet, you are often to me, and were yesterday especially, as a good watchman to admonish, that the howres of the night passe on, (for so I call my life as yet obscure and unserviceable to mankind) and that the day with me is at hand, wherein Christ commands all to labour, while there is light. Which because I am perswaded you doe to no other purpose then out of a true desire, that God should be honoured in every one, I therefore thinke my selfe bound, though unaskt, to give you account, as oft as occasion is, of this my tardie moving, according to the præcept of my conscience, which, I firmly trust, is not without God. Yet now I will not streine for any set apologie, but only referre myself to what my mind shall have at any tyme to declare her selfe at her best ease. But if you thinke, as you said, that too much love of learning is in fault, and that I have given up my selfe to dreame away my yeares in the armes of studious retirement, like Endymion with the moone, as the tale of Latmus goes; yet consider, that if it were no more but the meere love of learning, whether it proceed from a principle bad, good, or naturall, it could not have held out thus long against so strong opposition on the other side of every kind. For if it be bad, why should not all the fond hopes, that forward youth and vanitie are sledge with, together with gaine, pride, and ambition, call me forward more powerfully, then a poor regardlesse and unprofitable sin of curiosity should be able to withhold me, whereby a man cutts himselfe off from all action, and becomes the most helpless, pusillanimous, and unweaponed creature in the world, the most unfit and unable to doe that, which all mortals most aspire to, either to be usefull to his friends, or to offend his enemies. Or if it be to be thought an naturall pronenesse, there is against that a much more potent inclination inbred, which about this tyme of a man's life sollicit most, the desire of house and family of his owne, to which nothing is esteemed more helpful then the early entring into credible employment, and nothing hindering then this affected solitarinesse. And though this were anough, yet there is to this another act, if not of pure, yet of refined nature, no lesse

less available to dissuade prolonged obscurity, a desire of honour and repute and immortal fame seated in the breast of every true scholar, which all make haste to by the readiest ways of publishing and divulging conceived merits, as well those that shall, as those that never shall obtain it. Nature therefore would presently work the more prevalent way, if there were nothing but this inferior bent of herself to restrain her. Lastly, the love of learning, as it is the pursuit of something good, it would sooner follow the more excellent and supreme good known and presented, and so be quickly diverted from the empty and fantastic chase of shadows and notions, to the solid good flowing from due and timely obedience to that command in the gospel sett out by the terrible sealing of him, that hid the talent. It is more probable therefore, that not the endless delight of speculation, but this very consideration of that great commandment, does not presse forward, as soon as many do, to undergoe, but keeps off with a sacred reverence and religious advisement how best to undergoe; not taking thought of being late, so it give advantage to be more fit; for those, that were latest, lost nothing, when the maister of the vineyard came to give each one his hire. And here I am come to a streame-head, copious enough to disburden itself like Nilus at seven mouthes into an ocean. But then I should also run into a reciprocall contradiction of ebbing and flowing at once, and do that, which I excuse myself for not doing, 'preach and not preach.' Yet that you may see, that I am something suspicious of myselfe, and doe take notice of a certaine belatednesse in me, I am the bolder to send you some of my nightward thoughts some while since, because they come in not altogether unfitly, made up in a Petrarchian stanza, which I told you of.

How soon hath time, &c.

By this I believe you may well repent of having made mention at all of this matter; for if I have not all this while won you to this, I have certainly wearied you of it. This therefore alone may be a sufficient reason for me to keepe me as I am, least having thus tired you singly, I should deal worse with a whole congregation, and spoyle all the patience of a parish; for I myselfe doe not only see my own tediousnesse, but now grow offended with it, that has hindered me thus long from coming to the last and best period of my letter, and that which must now chiefly worke my pardon, that I am your true and unfained friend."

It appears from this letter, that his friend, to whom he wrote it, had importuned him to enter the service of the church; to which, says he in one of his tracts, "by the intentions of my parents and friends I was destined of a child, and in mine own resolutions, till coming to some maturity of yeers, and perceiving what tyranny had invaded the church, that he, who would take orders, must subscribe Slave, and take an oath withall, which unless he tooke with a conscience, that could retch, he must either strait perjure, or split his faith; I thought it better to prefer a blameless silence before the office of speaking, bought and begun with servitude and forswearing."

After he had taken the degree of master of arts in 1632, he left the university. Mr. Toland remarks, ^b that some verses in the first of his Latin elegies written from London to his friend Charles Diodati, in which he seems to reflect upon the university, and prefer the pleasures of the city, might probably give occasion to a calumny, that he either was expelled Cambridge, or left it in discontent, because he could obtain no preferment; and that at London he spent his time with leud women, or at play-houses. The verses are these:

^a Reason of Church Government, B. II. p. 41. Edit. 1641. in 4^{to}.

^b P. 7.

Me tenet urbs reflua quam Thameſis alluit unda,
 Meque nec invitum patria dulcis habet.
 Jam nec arundiferum mihi cura revifere Camum,
 Nec dudum vetiti me Laris angit amor.
 Nuda nec arva placent, umbraſque negantia molles!
 Quam male Phœbicolis convenit ille Locus!
 Nec duri libet uſque minas perferre magiſtri,
 Cæteraque ingenio non ſubeunda meo.
 Si ſit hoc exilium patrios adiſſe penates,
 Et vacuum curis otia grata ſequi,
 Non ego vel profugi nomen ſontemve reſuſo,
 Lætus & exilii conditione fruor.

Tempora nam licet hic placidis dare libera muſis,
 Et totum rapiunt me, mea vita, libri:
 Excepit hinc feſſum ſinuoſi pompa Theatri,
 Et vocat ad plauſus garrula Scena ſuos.

Sed neque ſub tecto ſemper nec in urbe latemus,
 Irreta nec nobis tempora veris eunt.
 Nos quoque lucus habet vicina conſitus ulmo,
 Atque ſuburbani nobilis umbra loci.
 Sæpius hic blandas ſpirantia ſydera flammas,
 Virgineos videas præteriſſe choros.

The author of the “*Modest confutation against a slanderous and scurrilous libel*” having charged him with “being vomited out of the university, after an inordinate and riotous youth spent there,” Milton writes thus in vindication of himself: “For which commodious lye, that he may be encouraged in the trade another time, I thank him; for it hath given me an apt occasion to acknowledge publickly, with all gratefull minde, that more then ordinary favour and respect, which I found above any of my equals at the hands of those curteous and learned men, the fellows of that colledge, wherein I spent some yeares; who at my parting, after I had taken two degrees, as the manner is, signified many wayes, how much better it would content them, that I would stay; as by many letters full of kindness and loving respect both before that time and long after, I was assured of their singular good affection towards me. Which being likewise propense to all such, as were for their studious and civill life worthy of esteeme, I could not wrong their judgments and upright intentions so much, as to think I had that regard from them for other cause, than that I might be still encouraged to proceed in the honest and laudable courses, of which they apprehended I had given good prooffe. And to those ingenuous and friendly men, who were ever the countenancers of vertuous and hopefull wits, I wish the best and happiest things, that friends in absence wish one to another.” We find the abovementioned calumny repeated by the author of “*Regii sanguinis clamor ad cœlum adversus Parricidas Anglicanos*,” who affirms, that it was reported, that Milton had been expelled Cambridge for his scandalous behaviour; and to avoid this disgrace, left his countrey, and gone to Italy, “*Alunt hominem Cantabrigienſi Academia ob flagitia pulſum, dedecus & patriam fuſiſſe, & in Italiam commiſſe.*” In answer to this our author in his “*Defensio ſecunda*” assures us, that he

^a Apology for Smeſtymnus, p. 12. Edit. in 4to.
^c P. 82. Edit. 1652.

^b Cap. 1. p. 9. Edit. Hague 1652 in 4to.

had lived at Cambridge without the least of irregularity of behaviour, and esteemed by all good men, till he had taken the degree of master of arts with applause; and did not fly into Italy, but went voluntarily to his father's house, to the great regret of most of the fellows of his college, by whom he was highly respected.

For the space of five years he lived for the most part with his father and mother at their house at Horton near Colebrook in Buckinghamshire, ^a whither his father, having acquired a sufficient estate, and left off all business, was retired ^b. Here our author at full leisure read over all the Greek and Latin writers; but was not so much in love with his solitude, as not to make now and then an excursion to London, sometimes to buy books, or to meet his friends from Cambridge; and at other times to learn something new in the mathematics or music, with which he was extremely delighted ^c.

In 1634 he wrote his "Mask performed before the president of Wales at Ludlow-Castle." In the library of Trinity-College at Cambridge is the original manuscript of this Piece, which, with other manuscripts of our poet, being found by the reverend Dr. Charles Mason, the present Woodwardian professor, among other papers, which once belonged to Sir Henry Newton Puckering, a considerable benefactor to the library of that college, were collected in 1736 into a volume, by the care and at the expence of Thomas Clarke, Esq; formerly fellow of that college, and now one of his majesty's council. This manuscript of the Mask having been compared by me with the printed edition, as it will undoubtedly be no small gratification to every reader of taste, to see the first thoughts and subsequent corrections of so great a poet, I shall set them down, distinguishing the lines, in which they occur, by inverted comma's. Mr. Waller's observation is a very just one:

Poets lose half the praise they should have got,
Could it be known what they discreetly blot.

A M A S K E. 1634.

The first Scene discovers a wild Wood.

A Guardian Spirit or Dæmon.

After the Line [In Regions milde, &c.] follow these Lines cross'd out:

" A Midst th' Hesperian gardens, on whose banks

" " Bedew'd with nectar and celestiall songs,

" " Æternal roses grow, and hyacinth,

" " And fruits of golden rind, on whose fair tree

" " The scaly-harrest dragon ever keeps

" " His unincharmed ^d eye: around the verge

" " And sacred limits of this blissfull ^e isle,

" " The jealous ocean, that old river, winds

" " His farre extended armes, till with steepe fall

" " Halfe his waste flood the wide Atlantique fills,

" " And half the slow unfadomed Stygian poole. ^f

" " But, soft, I was not sent to court your wonder

" " With distant worlds, and strange removed climes,

" " Yet thence I come, and oft from thence behold

" " Above the smoake, &c.

^a Philips, p. 7. and Toland, p. 7.
Defensio secunda, p. 83. Edit. 1654.

^b Philips and Toland erroneously say Berkshire.
^d Never charmed.

^c Miltoni
^f Poole of Styx.

After

After the line [Strive to keep up a frail and feaverish being] follows this crossed out;

" Beyond the written date of mortall change.

That *opes* the palace of eternity.

MS. " That *shews* the palace of Æternity."

But to my task, &c.

MS. " But to my buisnesse now. Neptune, whose sway

" Of every salt flood and each ebbing streame

" Tooke in by lot twixt high and neather Jove

" Imperiall rule of all the sea-girt isles."

The greatest and the best of all *the Maine*,

MS. " The greatest and the best of all *his Empire*."

Whom therefore she brought up, and Comus nam'd.

MS. " Whom therefore she brought up, and nam'd him Comus."

And in thick shelter of black shades imbower'd, &c.

MS. " And in thick covert of black shade imbour'd,

" Excells his mother at her potent Art."

For most doe taste through fond intemperate thirst.

MS. " For most doe taste through weake intemperate thirst."

All other parts remaining as they were,

MS. " All other parts remaining as before."

Likeliest and neereft to the present ayd, &c.

MS. " Neereft and likeliest to give præsent aide

" Of this occasion: But I hear the tread

" Of Virgin steps: I must be viewlesse now."

Goes out.

MS. " Comus enters, with a charming rod and glasse of liquor, with his rout all headed like some wild beafts; thire garments, some like men's, and some like women's. They come on in a wild and antick fashion. Intrant *Καμὰ Κορρη*.

In the steep Atlantic stream, &c.

MS. " In the steepe Tartarian streame,

" And the slope sun his upward beame

" Shoots against the Northern pole."

And Advice with scrupulous head,

MS. " And quick Law with her scrupulous head."

And on the tawny Sands and Shelves.

MS. " And on the yellow Sands and Shelves."

Stay thy cloudy Ebon chair.

MS. " Stay thy polisht Ebon chaire,

" Wherein thou ridst with Hecate,

" And favour our close Jocondrie,

" Till all thy dues bee done, and nought left out."

In a light fantastic Round,

MS. " With a light and frolic Round,"

The Measure.

MS. " The measure in a wild, rude, and wanton antick."

Break off, break off, I feel the different pace, &c.

MS. " Breake off, breake off, I hear the different pace

" Of some chast footing neere about this ground.

" Some virgin sure, benighted in these woods,

" For so I can distinguish by myne art.

An Account of the Life and Writings

" Run to your shrouds, within these braks and trees ;

" Our number may affright."

——— Now to my charms

And to my wily trains,

MS. " ——— Now to my trains

" And to my mother's charmes."

——— Thus I hurl

My dazzling spells into the spungy air,

Of power to cheat the eye with blear illusion,

And give it false presentments, lest the place, &c.

" ——— Thus I hurle

" My powder'd spells into the spungie air,

" Of power to cheate the eye with sleight illusion,

" And give it false Præsentments, else the place, &c."

" And hug him into Snares

MS. " And hugge him into Nets."

I shall appear some harmelesse villager,

And hearken, if I may, her business here.

But here she comes, I fairly step aside.

MS. " I shall appeare some harmlesse villager,

" Whom thrift keeps up about his countrie geare.

" But heere she comes, I fairly step aside,

" And hearken, if I may, her buisnesse heere."

When for their teeming flocks, and granges full,

MS. " When for thire teeming flocks, and Garners full."

In the blind Mazes of this tangled wood,

MS. " In the blind Alleys of this arched wood."

Rose from the hindmost wheels of Phœbus wain.

MS. " Rose from the hindmost wheeles of Phœbus Chaire."

They had ingag'd their wandring steps too far,

And envious darknes, e'er they could return,

Had stole them from me.

MS. " They had ingag'd thire youthful steps too farre

" To the soone-parting light, and envious darknes

" Had stolne them from me."

With everlasting oil to give due Light

MS. " With everlasting oyle to give thire Light."

And ayrie touns, that syllable men's names.

MS. " And ayrie touns, that lure night-wanderers."

Thou hovering Angell, girt with golden wings,

And thou unblemisht form of Chastity, &c.

MS. " Thou flittering Angell girt with golden wings,

" And thou unspotted form of Chastity,

" I see ye visibly, and while I see yee,

" This duskye hollow is a paradise,

" And Heaven-gates ore my head : now I beleave,

" That the supreme good, to whome all things ill

" Are but as slavish officers of vengeance,

" Would send a glistering Cherub, if need were, &c.

Within thy airy shell

MS. " Within thy ayrie Cell."

——— Scylla wept,
And chid her barking waves into attention.
Dwell'ft here with Pan

MS. Liv'ft here with Pan."

To touch the prosperous growth of this tall wood.

MS. To touch the prospering growth of this tall wood."

Could that divide you from neer-ushering guides?

MS. " Could that divide you from thire ushering hands?"

Without the sure guefs of well-practiz'd feet.

MS. " Without sure steerage of well practiz'd feet."

Dingle, or bushy dell of this wild wood

MS. " Dingle, or bushie dell of this wide wood."

——— Square my tryal,

MS. " —— Square this tryal."

But O that hapless virgin, our lost sister!

Where may she wander now, whither betake her

From the chill dew, amongst rude burrs and thistles?

Perhaps some cold bank is her bolster now,

Or 'gainst the rugged bark of some broad elm

Leans her unpillow'd head fraught with sad fears.

What if in wild amazement and affright,

Or while we speak, within the direful grasp

Of savage hunger, or of savage heat?

ELDER BRO. Peace, brother, be not over-exquisite,

To cast the fastion of uncertain evils.

For grant they be so, while they rest unknown,

What need a man forestall his date of grief,

And run to meet what he would most avoid?

Or if they be but false alarms of fear,

How bitter is such self-delusion?

I do not think my sister, &c.

MS. " But oh that haplesse virgin, our lost sister!

" Where may she wander now, whither betake her

" From the chill dew in this dead solitude?

" Perhaps some cold banke is her bolster now,

" Or 'gainst the rugged barke of some broad elme

" She leans thoughfull head, musing at our unkindnesse,

" Or lost in wild amazment and affright

" So fares, as did forsaken Proserpine

" When the big wallowing flakes of pitchie clouds

" And darknesse wound her in.

" I BRO. Peace, brother, peace,

" I doe not think my sister, &c."

Could stir the constant mood of her calm thoughts,

MS. " Could stirre the stable mood of her calme thoughts."

Benighted walks under the mid-day sun;

Himself is his own dungeon.

MS. " Walks in black vapours, though the noon-tyde brand

" Blaze in the summer-solstice."

For who would rob a hermit of his weeds,

His few books, or his beads, or maple dish?

MS. " For who would rob a hermit of his beads,

His books, or his haire-gowne, or maple dish?"

Uninjur'd in this wilde surrounding waft.

MS. "Uninjur'd in this vast and hideous wild."

ELDER BRO. I do not, brother,

Infer, as if I thought my sister's state
Secure without all doubt or controversy :
Yet where an equal poise, &c.

MS. "——— I. BRO. I doe not, brother,

"Inferre, as if I thought my sister's state
"Secure, without all doubt or Question : No,
"I could be willing, though now i'th' darke, to trie
"A tough encounter * with the shaggiest ruffian,
"That lurks by hedge or lane of this dead circuit,
"To have her by my side, though I were sure
"She might be free from perill where she is.
"But where an equal poise, &c."

She that has that, is clad in compleat steel,
And like a quiver'd nymph with arrows keen,
May trace huge forrests and unharbour'd heaths,
Infamous hills, and sandy perilous wilds,
Where through the sacred rays of chastity,
No savage fierce, bandite, or mountaneere
Will dare to soil her virgin purity.

MS. "She that has that, is clad in compleate steele,

"And may, on every needfull accident,
"Be it not don in pride or wilfull tempting,
"Walk through huge forrests and unharbour'd heaths,
"Infamous hills, and sandie perilous wilds,
"Where through the sacred awe of chastitie,
"No savage feirce, bandite, or mountaneere
"Shall dare to soile her virgin puritie."

In fog, or fire, by lake, or moorish fen,
Blew meager hag, or stubborn unlaid ghost.

MS. "In fog, or fire, by lake, or moorie fen,

"Blue wrinckled hagge, or stubborne unlaid ghost."
That wise Minerva wore, unconquer'd virgin.

MS. "That wise Minerva wore, aternal virgin."

With suddenn adoration and blank awe.

MS. "With suddaine adoration of her purenesse.

That when a soul is found sincerely so.

MS. "That when it finds a soule sincerely so."

But most by leud and lavish act of sin.

MS. "And most by the lascivious act of sin."

Oft seen in charnel-vaults, and sepulchres
Lingering, &c.

MS. "Oft seen in charnel-vaults and monuments

Hovering, &c.

——— ELD. BRO. Lift, lift, I hear, &c.

MS. "——— Lift, lift, me thought, &c."

Some roving robber calling to his fellows.

MS. "Some curl'd man of the swoord calling to his fellows."

If he be friendly, he comes well; if not,
Defence is a good cause, and Heaven be for us.

MS. "If he be friendly, he comes well; if not,
"Had best looke to his forehead: heere be brambles."
Come not too near; you fall on iron stakes else.

MS. "Come not too neere; you fall on pointed stakes else."

SPIR.

MS. "DÆM."

And sweetned every musk-rose of the dale.

MS. "And sweetned every musk-rose of the valley."
Slipt from the fold,

MS. "Leapt ore the Penne."

What feares good Thyrsis?

MS. "What feares, good shepherd?

Deep-skill'd in all his mother's witcheries,

MS. "Nurtur'd in all his mother's witcheries."

Tending my flocks hard by i'th' hilly crofts.

MS. "Tending my flocks hard by i'th' pastur'd lawns."

With flaunting honyfuckle.

MS. "With spreading honyfuckle."

The aidless innocent lady.

MS. "The helpless innocent ladie."

Harpyes and hydra's, or all the monstrous forms

'Twixt Africa and Inde, I'll find him out,

And force him to restore his purchase back,

Or drag him by the curls, to a foul death

Curs'd as his life.

MS. "Harpyes and hydra's, or all the monstrous buggs

"Twixt Africa and Inde, Ile find him out,

"And force him to release his new-got prey,

"Or drag him by the curles, and cleave his scalpe

"Down to the hips.

But here thy sword can do thee little stead.

MS. "But here thy steele can doe thee small availe."

He with his bare wand can unthred thy joynts,

And crumble all thy sinews.

MS. "He with his bare wand can unquilt thy joynts,

And crumble every sinew."

And shew me simples of a thousand names.

MS. "And shew me simples of a thousand hues."

That Hermes once to wise Ulysses gave.

MS. "Which Mercury to wise Ulysses gave."

(As I will give you, when we go.)

MS. "(As I will give you, as we go.)"

Boldly assault the Necromancer's hall,

Where if he be, with dauntless hardihood,

And brandish't blade rush on him, break his glasse,

And shed the luscious liquor on the ground.

MS. "Bold assault the Necromantick hall,

"Where if he be, with suddaine violence,

"And brandish't blade rush on him, breake his glasse,

"And powre the luscious potion on the ground.

- Thyrsis, lead on apace ; Ile follow thee,
And some good angel bear a shield before us.
- MS. " Thyrsis, lead on a-pace ; I follow thee,
" And good Heaven cast his best regard upon us."
That fancy can beget on youthful thoughts,
When the fresh blood grows lively.
- MS. " That youth and fancie can beget,
" When the briske blood grows lively."
To life so friendly, or so coole to thirst.
Why should you be so cruel to your self ?
- MS. " To life so friendly, and so coole to thirst.
" Poor ladie thou hast need of some refreshing.
" Why should you, &c.
—— But, fair virgin,
This will restore all soon.
- MS. " —— Heere, fair virgin,
" This will restore all soone."
" These oughly-headed monsters.
- MS. " These ougly-headed monsters."
With visor'd falshood and base forgery.
- MS. " With visor'd falshood and base forgeries."
To those budge doctors of the stoick furr.
- MS. " To those budge doctors of the stoick gowne."
Thronging the seas with spawn innumerable,
But all to please, and fate the curious tast.
- MS. " Cramming the seas with spawne innumerable,
" The fields with cattell, and the aire with fowle."
Should in a pet of temperance feed on pulse.
- MS. " Should in a pet of temperance feed on fetches.
The sea o'erfraught would swell, and th'unsought diamond
Would so emblaze the forehead of the deep,
And so bestudd with stars, that they below
Would grow inur'd to Light, and come at last
To gaze upon the Sun with shameless brows."
- MS. " The Sea o'erfraught would heave her waters up
" Above the stars, and th'unsought diamonds,
" And so bestudde the Center with thire light,
" Were they not taken thence, that they below
" Would grow enur'd to day, and come at last
" To gaze upon the Sun with shamelesse browes."
It withers on the stalk with languisht head.
- MS. " It withers on the stalke, and fades away."
They had their name thence, coarse complexions.
- MS. " They had their name thence, coarse beetle-brows."
And bound him fast ; without his rod reverst,
- MS. " And bound him fast ; without his art reverst."
We cannot free the Lady, that sits here,
- MS. " We cannot free the Lady, that remains."
Some other means I have.
- MS. " There is another Way."
Sabrina is her name, a virgin pure.
- MS. " Sabrina is her name, a goddess chaste."

The guiltless damsel flying the mad pursuit

MS. "She guiltlesse damsell flying the mad per suite."
Commended her fair innocence to the flood,

MS. "Commended her faire innocence to the streame."
Held up their pearled wrists, and took her in,
Bearing her strait to aged Nereus hall.

MS. "Held up thire white wrists, and receav'd her in,
"And bore her strait to aged Nereus Hall."
Helping all urchin blasts, and ill luck signs,
That the shrewd medling elfe delights to make,
Which she with pretious viol'd liquors heals.

MS. "Helping all urchin blasts, and ill-luck signes,
"That the shrewd medling elfe delights to leave,
"And often takes our cattel with strange pinches,
"Which she with pretious viol'd liquors heales.
Carrol her goodness loud in rustick layes.

MS. "Carrol her goodnesse loud in lively lays.
Of pansies, pinks, and gaudy daffadils.

MS. "Of pansies, and of bonnie daffadils."

The clasping charm, and thaw the numming spell.

MS. "Each clasping charme, and secret holding spell."
In hard besetting need, this I will try,
And add the Power of some adjuring verse.

MS. "In honour'd vertue's cause, this will I trie,
And add the power of some adjuring verse."
That in the channel strayes.

MS. "That my rich wheelles inlayes."
Brightest lady, looke on me.

MS. "Vertuous ladie, looke on me."

To wait in Amphitrite's bow'r.

MS. "To waite on Amphitrite in her bowre."
May thy brimmed waves for this.

MS. "May thy crySTALL waves for this."

That tumbled down the snowy hills.

MS. "That tumbled down from snowie hills."

Where this night are met in state.

MS. "Where this night are come in state."

Come let us haste, the stars grow high,

"But night sits monarch yet in the mid sky."

MS. "Come let us haste, the stars are high,
But night reignes monarch yet in the mid skie,"
Of lighter toes, and such court guise,
As Mercury did first devise.

MS. "Of lighter toes, and courtly guise,
"Such as Hermes did devise.

With a crown of deathless praise.

MS. "To a crown of deathlesse bays."

Than her purfled scarf can shew,
And drenches with Elysian Dew,

MS. "Than her purfled scarfe can shew,
"Yellow, watchet, greene and blew,
"And drenches with Sabæan dew."

The first edition of this Mask, as appears from Sir Henry Wotton's letter to our author dated April 13th, 1638, was at the end of Mr. R's poems at Oxford; and it was printed separately at London in 1637 in 4to, under the following title; "A Mask presented at Ludlow-Castle, 1634, on Michaelmasse night, before the right honorable John earl of Bridgewater, viscount Brackley, lord præfident of Wales, and one of his majesties most honorable privie counsell. The dedication of it by Mr. H. Lawes to the right honorable John lord viscount Brackley, son and heir apparent to the earl of Bridgewater, &c. is as follows:

"MY LORD,
THIS Poem, which received its first occasion of birth from your selfe and others of your noble familie, and much honour from your own person in the performance, now returns againe to make a finall dedication of itselſe to you. Although not openly acknowledged by the author, yet it is a legitimate offspring, so lovely and so much desired, that the often copying of it hath tired my pen to give my severall friends satisfaction, and brought me to a necessitie of producing it to the publick view, and now to offer it up in all rightfull devotion to those faire hopes and rare endowments of your much-promising youth, which give a full assurance to all that know you of a future excellence. Live, sweet lord, to be the honour of your name, and receive this as your owne, from the hands of him, who hath by many favours beene long obliged to your most honoured parents; and, as in this repræsentation your attendant Thyrsis, so now in all real expression,

Your faithfull and most humble servant,

H. Lawes."

The close of this edition of the Mask informs us, that the principal persons who performed in it, were John lord Brackley, Mr. Tho. Egerton, and the lady Alice Egerton. This piece is very beautiful, and of a kind purely original^b; and as Mr. Warburton observes in a letter to me containing several curious remarks upon Milton, in this piece our author has Shakespeare very much in his eye, and "there is a brighter vein of poetry intermix'd with a softness of description, than is to be found in the charming scenes of Eden."

This admirable piece being adapted to the stage by Mr. John Dalton, now doctor of divinity, and prebendary of Worcester, by dividing it into scenes and acts, with proper additions and alterations, was exhibited at Drury-lane, on the 4th of March, 1738, where it was received for many nights with an applause, that did no less honour to the public taste, than to the name of Milton.

In November 1637, he wrote his Lycidas, in which he laments the death of his friend Mr. Edward King, who was drowned in his passage from Chester on the Irish Seas, 1637. This poem of our author was printed the year following at Cambridge, in 4to, in a collection of Latin and English poems upon Mr. King's death. The Latin poems have this title: *Justa Edoardo King naufrago ab amicis mœrentibus amoris & pietatis christi*. This part contains 36 pages, and consists of poems by T. Farnaby, H. More, J. Pearson, &c. The Latin epitaph informs us, that Mr. King was Son of Sir John King, Secretary for Ireland to queen Elizabeth, king James I. and Charles I. and that he was fellow of Christ's-College Cambridge, and was drowned on the 10th of August 1637, aged 25 years. The English part is entitled, "Obsequies to the Memorie of Mr. Edward King, Anno Domini 1638." It contains twenty-five pages, and

^a Perhaps Mr. Tho. Randolph; but I have never met with any edition of his Poems, to which Milton's Mask is added. ^b Life of Milton, p. 14. prefixed to Explanatory notes and remarks on Milton's Paradise Lost. By J. Richardson, father and son. Edit. London 1734 in 8vo.

consists of poems by H. King, J. Beaumont, J. Cleaveland, W. More, W. Hall, Saml. Briggs, Isaac Olivier, J. H. C. B. R. B. T. N. J. M. i. e. John Milton, whose Lycidas is the last of the poems.

I shall subjoin here the first thoughts of Milton, as they appear in his own manuscript abovementioned.

Who would not sing for Lycidas? he knew.

MS. "Who would not sing for Lycidas? he well knew."

And bid fair peace be to my fable shroud.

MS. "To bid faire peace be to my fable shroud."

Under the opening eye-lids of the morn.

MS. "Under the glimmering eye-lids of the morne."

Oft till the star, that rose at ev'ning bright,

Toward Heaven's descent had stop'd his westering wheel.

MS. "Oft till the Even-starre bright

"Toward Heaven's descent had stoapt his burnisht wheele."

Or frost to flowers, that their gay wardrop wear.

MS. "Or frost to flowers, that thire gay buttons weare."

Where your old bards, the famous Druids, lie.

MS. "Where the old bards, the famous Druids, lie."

What could the muse herself, that Orpheus bore?

The muse herself for her enchanting son,

Whom universal nature did lament,

When by the rout, that made the hideous roar,

His goary visage down the stream was sent,

Down the swift Hebrus to the Lesbian shore.

MS. "What could the golden-hayr'd Calliope

"For her inchaunting son,

"When shee beheld (the Gods farre-fighted be)

"His goarie scalpe rowle down the Thracian lee."

Or with the tangles of Neæra's hair.

MS. "Hid in the tangles of Neæra's haire."

O fountain Arethuse, and thou honour'd flood,

Smooth-sliding Mincius.

MS. "Oh fountain Arethuse, and thou smooth flood,

"Soft-sliding Mincius."

Inwrought with figures dim.

MS. "Scraul'd ore with figures dim."

Daily devours apace, and nothing fed.

MS. "Daily devours apace, and little fed."

On whose fresh lap the swart star sparely looks,

Throw hither all your quaint enamel'd eyes.

MS. "On whose fresh lap the swart starre stintly looks,

"Bring hither all your quaint enamel'd eyes."

Bring the rathe primrose that forsaken dies,

The tufted crow-toe, and pale gessamine,

The white pink, and the pansie freakt with jet,

The glowing violet;

The musk-rose, and the well attired woodbine,

With cowslips wan that hang the pensive head,

And every flower that sad embroidery wears.

Bid Amaranthus all his beauty shed,

And daffadillies fill their cups with tears.

MS. "Bring the rathe primrose that unwedded dies,
 " Colouring the pale cheek of unenjoy'd love,
 " And that sad floure that strove
 " To write his own woes on the vermel graine.
 " Next adde Narcissus, that still weeps in vaine :
 " The woodbine and the pancie freakt with jet ;
 " The glowing violet ;
 " The cowslip wan, that hangs his pensive head ;
 " And every bud, that sorrow's liverie weares.
 " Let daffadillies fill thire cups with teares :
 " Bid Amaranthus all his beautie shed."
 Let our frail thoughts dally with false surmise.

MS. "Let our sad thoughts," &c.

Aye me ! whilst thee the shores and sounding seas.

MS. "Aye mee, whilst thee the floods and sounding seas."
 Where thou perhaps under the whelming tide.

MS. "Where thou perhaps under the humming tide."
 Sleepst by the fable of Bellerus old.

MS. "Sleepst by the fable of Corineus old."
 And hears the unexpressive nuptial song.

MS. "Listening the unexpressive nuptial song."

About the time of writing his *Lycidas*, we find two letters of his to his friend Deodat, in the former of which, dated from London, Sept 2. 1637, he acknowledges himself to be slow in his epistolary correspondence, from his natural disposition, by which, when he was once engaged in any study, he was urged on to prosecute it with his full vigour and application, and could scarce bear the least interruption in its pursuit. In the next, dated likewise from London the 23d of the same month, he declares himself a zealous follower of moral beauty and virtue, with a thorough contempt for the opinions of the mere vulgar ; and with a just consciousness of his own powers, and a presentiment of the important rank, which the cultivation of them would one day advance him to in his own age, and all future ones, intimates, the object of his thoughts was no less than that of immortality. In this letter he mentions his design of taking chambers in one of the inns of court, which had the advantage of a garden, not being pleased with his present situation. And it appears from it, that he had already read the whole Greek history, to the period, when the nation ceased to be Greek, and that of Italy under the Lombards, Franks and Germans, till the emperor Rodolphus granted them their liberty.

Having spent five years at home, upon the death of his mother he obtained leave of his father to travel abroad ; and having waited upon Sir Henry Wotton, formerly ambassador at Venice, and then provost of Eaton college, to whom he communicated his design, that gentlemen soon after wrote to him the following letter, dated from the college April 18th, 1638.

SIR,

" IT was a special favour, when you lately bestowed upon me here the first taste of your acquaintance, though no longer than to make me know, that I wanted more time to value it, and to enjoy it rightly. And in truth, if I could then have imagined your farther stay in these parts, which I understood afterward by Mr. H. I would have been bold, in our vulgar phrase, to mend my draught, for you left me with an extreme thirst ; and to have begged your conversation again jointly with your said learned

learned friend, at a poor meal or two, that we might have banded together some good authors of the ancient time, among which I observed you to have been familiar.

Since your going, you have charged me with new obligations, both for a very kind letter from you, dated the sixth of this month, and for a dainty piece of entertainment, that came therewith; wherein I should much commend the tragical part, if the lyrical did not ravish with a certain Doric delicacy in your songs and odes, wherein I must plainly confess to have seen yet nothing parallel in our language, *Ipsa mollites*. But I must not omit to tell you, that I now only owe you thanks for intimating unto me, how modestly soever, the true artificer. For the work itself I had viewed some good while before with singular delight, having received it from our common friend Mr. R. in the very close of the late R's Poems printed at Oxford; whereunto it is added, as I now suppose, that the accessory might help out the principal, according to the art of Stationers, and leave the reader *con la bocca dolce*.

Now, Sir, concerning your travels, wherein I may challenge a little more privilege of discourse with you; I suppose, you will not blanch Paris in your way. Therefore I have been bold to trouble you with a few lines to Mr. M. B. whom you shall easily find attending the young lord S. as his governor; and you may surely receive from him good directions for shaping of your farther journey into Italy, where he did reside by my choice some time for the king, after mine own recess from Venice.

I should think, that your best line will be through the whole length of France to Marseilles, and thence by sea to Genoa, whence the passage into Tuscany is as diurnal as a Gravesend barge. I hasten, as you do, to Florence or Sienna, the rather to tell you a short story, from the interest you have given me in your safety.

At Sienna I was tabled in the house of one Alberto Scipioni, an old Roman courtier in dangerous times, having been steward to the Duca di Pagliano, who with all his family were strangled, save this only man, that escaped by foresight of the tempest. With him I had often much chat of those affairs; into which he took pleasure to look back from his native harbour; and at my departure towards Rome, which had been the center of his experience, I had won confidence enough to beg his advice, how I might carry myself securely there, without offence of others, or of mine own conscience: "Signor Arrigo mio," says he, "i pensieri stretti, & il viso sciolto," that is, "your thoughts close, and your countenance loose," will go safely over the whole world. Of which Delphian oracle (for so I have found it) your judgment doth need no commentary; and therefore, Sir, I will commit you with it to the best of all securities, God's dear love, remaining

Your friend, as much at command as any of longer date,

H. Wotton."

"P. S. Sir, I have expressly sent this by my foot-boy to prevent your departure, without some acknowledgment from me of the receipt of your obliging letter, having myself through some business, I know not how, neglected the ordinary conveyance. In any part where I shall understand you fixed, I shall be glad and diligent to entertain you with home-novelties, even for some fomentation of our friendship, too soon interrupted in the cradle."

Soon after the receipt of this letter he set out for France, accompanied only with one servant, who attended him through all his travels. At Paris he waited upon the lord Scudamore, ambassador from king Charles I. in France. His lordship received him with great civility; and understanding that Mr. Milton had a desire to make a visit to Hugo Grotius, ambassador from Christina queen of Sweden to the court of France, sent several of his attendants to wait upon him, and introduce him in his name to that

great man. After a few days, not intending to make the usual tour of France, he took his leave of the lord Scudamore, who gave him letters to the English merchants residing in any part, through which he was to travel, in which they were requested to do him all the good offices, which lay in their power. From Paris he hasten'd on his journey to Nice, where he embarked for Genoa, from whence he went to Leghorn, and Pisa, and so to Florence. In this city he staid two months, during which time he contracted an intimate acquaintance with several persons of the highest distinction for learning and quality, and was daily present at their private academies, which they held, according to the laudable custom of Italy, for the improvement of learning and friendship^a. For the custom was, as he says himself, in the preface to his second book "Of the Reason of Church-Government," that every one must give some proof of his wit and reading in those assemblies. And his productions were honoured with written encomiums, which the Italians were not forward to bestow on men of this side the Alps. His principal friends here were Giacomo Gaddi, Carlo Dati, Frescobaldi, Coltellino, Benedetto Bonmatthei, Clementilli, Antonio Francini, &c. Carlo Dati gave him the following testimonial of his esteem.

JOHANNI MILTONI, Londinensi, Juveni patriâ, virtutibus eximio :

Viro, qui multa peregrinatione, studio cuncta orbis terrarum loca perspexit, ut novus Ulysses omnia ubique ab omnibus apprehenderet. Polyglotto, in cujus ore linguæ jam deperditæ sic reviviscunt, ut idiomata omnia sint in ejus laudibus infacunda ; & jure ea percullit, ut admirationes & plausus populorum ab propriâ sapientiâ excitatos intelligat. Illi, cujus Animi Dotes corporisque sensus ad admirationem commovent, & per ipsam motum cuique auferunt ; cujus opera ad plausus hortantur, sed venustate vocem auditoribus adimunt. Cui in memoriâ totus orbis ; in intellectu sapientia ; in voluntate ardor gloriæ ; in ore eloquentia. Harmonicos cælestium sphaerarum sonitus, astronomiâ duce, audienti ; characteres mirabilium naturæ, per quos Dei magnitudo describitur, magistrâ philosophiâ, legenti ; antiquitatum latebras, vetustatis excidia, eruditionis ambages, comite assiduâ autorum lectione, exquirenti, restauranti, percurrenti. At cur nitor in arduum ? Illi, in cujus virtutibus evulgandis ora famæ non sufficiant, nec hominum stupor in laudandis satis est. Reverentiæ & amoris ergo hoc ejus meritis debitum admirationis tributum offert

CAROLUS DATUS patricius Florentinus,
Tanto homini Servus, tantæ virtutis amator.

Antonio Francini is not less liberal of his praises of our author in the long Italian ode, which he composed in his honour, and in which he complements the English nation, and foretold the eminent figure which Milton would make in the world. The eighth of our author's "Familiar Letters," dated at Florence, Sept. 10th, 1638, is written to Benedetto Bonmatthei, upon the latter's design of publishing an Italian grammar, in which he advises him to add some observations concerning the true pronunciation of that language, for the sake of foreigners.

From Florence he took his journey next to Sienna, and from thence to Rome, where he staid about two months, and became acquainted with several learned men, particularly Lucas Holstenius, keeper of the Vatican library^b, who shewed him all the Greek authors, whether published or otherwise, which had passed through his correction ; and introduced him to cardinal Barberini, who, at an entertainment of music performed at his own expence, waited for him at the door, and brought him into the assembly. To thank Holstenius for these favours, Milton wrote the ninth of his "Familiar Let-

^a Miltoni Defensio secunda p. 84. Edit. 1654. and Philips, p. 11, 12.
p. 84, 85. Edit. 1654. and Philips, p. 13.

^b Miltoni Defensio secunda,
ters,"

ters," dated at Florence, March 30th, 1639. At Rome he likewise commenced a friendship with Giovanni Salfilli, who wrote the following epigram upon him.

Ad Joannem Miltonem, Anglum triplici poeseos laureâ coronandum; Græcâ nimirum, Latinâ, atque Hetruscâ, Epigramma Joannis Salfilli Romani.

Cede, Meles; cedat depressâ Mincius urna;
Sebetus Taffum definat usque loqui:
At Themesis victor cunctis ferat altior undas,
Nam per te, Milto, par tribus unus erit.

Milton in return sent to Salfilli, soon after lying sick, those fine scazons, which may be read among his juvenile poems. Here likewise Selvaggi wrote the following distich upon him:

Græcia Mæonidem, jactet sibi Roma Maronem:
Anglia Miltonum jactat utrique parem.

From Rome he travelled to Naples, where he was introduced by a certain hermit, who accompanied him in his journey from Rome thither, to Giovanni Baptista Manso a marquis of Villa, a Neapolitan by birth, a person of great quality and merit, to whom Tasso inscribed his Dialogue of friendship, and whom that poet makes honourable mention of in the xxth Book of his Gierusalemme conquistate, l. xx.

Fra Cavalieri magnanimi è cortesi
Risplende il Manso.

The marquis received Milton with extraordinary respect and civility, and went himself to shew him all the remarkable places in the city, visiting him often at his lodging, and made this distich in honour of him:

Ut mens, forma, decor, facies, mos, si pietas sic,
Non Anglus, verum herclè Angelus ipse fores.

The exception to Milton's piety relates to his being a protestant; and the marquis told him at his departure, that he should have been glad to have done him several other good offices, if he had been more reserved in matters of religion^b. Our author out of gratitude for the marquis's civilities, before he left Naples, sent him a beautiful Latin eclogue, intitled Mansus; in which he intimates his design of writing a poem upon the story of king Arthur, as appears from the following lines:

O mihi si mea fors talem concedat amicum,
Phœbæos decorasse viros qui tam bene nôrit,
Si quando indigenas revocabo in carmina reges,
Arturumque etiam sub terris bella moventem:
Aut dicam invictæ sociali fœdere mensæ
Magnanimos Heroas, & (O modo spiritus adsit)
Erangam Saxonicas Britonum sub marte phalanges.

He was now preparing to pass over into Sicily and Greece, when he was diverted from his resolution by the sad news of a civil war breaking forth in England; esteeming it an unworthy thing for him to be taking his pleasure in foreign parts, while his country-

^a Miltoni Defensio secunda, ubi supra.

^b Ibid.

men were contending at home for liberty. However, he resolved to see Rome once more; and though the merchants gave him a caution, that the jesuits were framing designs against him, by reason of the freedom, which he used in his discourses about religion, yet he ventured to go to Rome the second time, determining with himself not to begin any dispute about religion; but being asked, not to dissemble his sentiments. He staid two months in that city, neither concealing his name, nor declining openly to defend the truth, when any thought proper to attack him. Notwithstanding this, he returned safe to his friends at Florence, who received him with great joy and affection. Here he stay'd as long as he had done before, except an excursion of a few days to Lucca; and then crossing the Appennine, passed through Bologna and Ferrara to Venice, where having spent one month, and shipped off the books, which he had collected in his travels through Italy, he came through Verona, Milan, and along the lake Lemano to Geneva. In this city he contracted an intimate friendship with Giovanni Deodati, and Frederic Spanheim^a, both professors of divinity there. He returned through France by the same way, which he passed in going to Italy; and after having been absent from England about a year and three months, arrived safe in his own country about the time of the king's second expedition against the Scots^b, in which his forces under lord Conway were defeated by General Lesley, on the 29th of August, 1639. Upon his return, he had the misfortune of being assured of the death of his dearest friend and school-fellow, Charles Deodati, who was descended from a father, originally of Lucca in Tuscany, but his mother was English, and he was born and educated in England. This gentleman studied physic, and was an excellent scholar. Mr. Toland tells us^c, that he had in his hands two Greek letters of Deodati's to Milton, written with great elegance. Milton lamented his immature death in an excellent Latin eclogue, intitled Damon, extant among his poems; by which we find, that he had already conceived the plan of an epic poem, the subject of which he designed to be the warlike actions of the old British heroes, and particularly of king Arthur, as he tells us himself in these verses:

Ipse ego Dardanias Rutupina per æquora puppes
Dicam, & Pandrasidos regnum vetus Inogeniæ,
Brennumque Arviragumque duces, priscumque Belinum,
Et tandem Armoricos Britonum sub lege colonos;
Tum gravidam Arturo fatali fraude Jogernen,
Mendaces vultus, assumptaque Gorlois arma,
Merlini dolus.

He then declares his design of performing something in his native language, which might perpetuate his name in these islands, though he should be the more obscure and inglorious by it to the rest of the world.

——— O mihi tum si vita supersit,
Tu procul annosâ pendebis, Fistula, pinu
Multum oblita mihi, aut patriis mutata camæris
Brittonicum strides; quid enim? omnia non licet uni,
Non sperâsse uni licet omnia: mi satis ampla
Merces, & mihi grande decus (sim ignotus in ævum
Tum licet, externo penitusque inglorius orbi)
Si me flava comas legat Ufa, & potor Alauni,

^a Toland p. 20. says Ezechiel Spanheim, the celebrated critic and antiquary, and son of Frederic: But this is undoubtedly a mistake, for Ezechiel was but ten years old, when Milton was at Geneva, though the latter afterwards had a correspondence with him, as appears from the 17th of his familiar letters. ^b Miltoni Defensio secunda, p. 85, 86, 87, Edit. 1654. ^c P. 10.

Vorticibusque frequens Abra, & nemus omne Treantæ,
Et Thamefis meus ante omnes, & fusca metallis
Tamara, & extremis me discunt Orcades undis.

Soon after his return, and visits paid to his father and his friends, he hir'd a lodging in St. Bride's Church-yard in Fleet-street, at the house of Mr. Ruffel a Taylor, where he undertook the education and instruction of his sister's two sons, Edward and John Philips; the younger of whom, John, had been wholly committed to his care. And here it will not be impertinent to mention the many Latin and Greek authors, which, through his excellent judgment and method of teaching, far above the pedantry of common schools, (where such authors are scarce ever heard of) were read over, within no greater compass of time, than from ten to fifteen years of age. Of the Latin, the four grand writers de Re Rusticâ, Cato, Varro, Columella, and Palladius; Cornelius Celsus, the physician; a great part of Pliny's Natural history; Vitruvius's architecture; Frontinus's stratagems; and the philosophical poets, Lucretius and Manilius. Of the Greek writers, Hesiod; Aratus's phænomena and Diosemeia; Dionysius de situ orbis; Oppian; Quintus Calaber; Apollonius Rhodius; Plutarch's placita philosophorum, & *περί των ἀγογίας*; Geminus's astronomy; Xenophon's institution of Cyrus and *Ἀνάξαρτος*; Ælian's tactics; and Polyænus's stratagems.

Thus by teaching, he in some measure enlarged his own knowledge, having the reading of all these authors by proxy; and all this might possibly have conduced to the preserving of his sight, if he had not been perpetually engaged in reading and writing. Nor did this application of his to the Latin and Greek tongues hinder him from attaining the principal of the oriental languages, viz. the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac, and a good skill in mathematics and astronomy. The Sunday's work for his pupils was for the most part to read a chapter of the Greek testament, and hear his exposition of it. The next work after this was to write from his dictation some part of a system of divinity, which he collected from the most eminent writers upon that subject, as Amesius, Wollebius, &c. ^b.

He did not continue long in his lodgings in St. Bride's church-yard, but took an handsome garden-house in Aldersgate-street, situated at the end of a passage, and the fitter for his purpose by reason of its privacy and freedom from noise and disturbance. Here it was, that he put his academical institution in practice, he himself giving an example of hard study and spare diet to those under him; for it was not long before his elder nephew, Mr. Edward Philips, was put to board with him. Only this advantage he had, says Mr. Philips ^c, "that once in three weeks or a month, he would drop into the society of some young sparks of his acquaintance; the chief whereof were Mr. Alphry and Mr. Millar, two gentlemen of Gray's-Inn, the beaux of those days. With these gentlemen he would so far make bold with his body, as now and then to keep a gawdy-day." In this house he continued several years.

He had scarce settled himself in London, after his return from his travels, when upon the meeting of the long parliament on the 3d of November, 1640, he found, as he observes himself ^d, a general clamour against the bishops, some complaining of their ill conduct, and others of the very order itself, and that England should differ from all the other reformed churches in the form of its ecclesiastical government. His zeal for liberty in general therefore engaged him in a warm opposition to episcopal authority, which he imagined inconsistent with it; in 1641, he published at London in 4to, a piece, intitled, "Of Reformation touching Church-Discipline in England, and the causes that hitherto have hindred it. Two Bookes. Written to a Friend."

^a Philips, p. 16, 17.

^b Ibid. p. 18, 19.

^c Ibid. p. 20, 21.

^d Defensio secunda, p. 88.

About the same time certain ministers wrote a treatise against episcopacy, printed at London 1641, in 4to, under the following title: "An answer to a book, intituled," An humble remonstrance; "in which the originall of liturgy and episcopacy is discussed, and queries propounded concerning both; the parity of bishops and presbyters in scripture demonstrated; the occasion of their imparitie in antiquitie discovered; the disparitie of the ancient and our moderne bishops manifested; the antiquitie of ruling elders in the church vindicated; the prelatical church bownded. Written by Smectymnuus." The authors of this treatise were five, the first letters of whose Christian and Sur-names compose the word Smectymnuus; viz. Stephed Marshal, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurstow. The "Humble Remonstrance," to which this was designed as an answer, was written by Dr. Joseph Hall, bishop of Norwich. Archbishop Usher having published, in opposition to Smectymnuus, a tract concerning the "Original of bishops and metropolitans," printed at Oxford 1641 in 4to; Milton published at London the same year in 4to, a piece intituled, "Of Prelatical Episcopacy, and whether it may be deduced from the apostolical times by virtue of those testimonies, which are alledged to that purpose in some late treatises; one whereof goes under the name of James archbishop of Armagh."

His next performance was "The Reason of Church-government urg'd against Prelaty: By Mr. John Milton." In two Books. London 1641 in 4to. In the beginning of the second book he mentions his design of writing a poem in the English language; where he tells us, "that in the privat academies of Italy, whither I, says he, was favoured to resort, perceiving, that some trifles, which I had in memory, composed at under twenty or thereabout, (for the manner is, that every one must give some proof of his wit and reading there) met with acceptance above what was lookt for, and other things, which I had shifted in scarcity of books and conveniencies to patch up amongst them, were received with written encomiums, which the Italian is not forward to bestow on men on this side the Alps; I began thus farre to assent both to them and divers of my friends here at home, and not lesse to an inward prompting, which now grew daily upon me, that by labour and intent study, (which I take to be my portion in this life) joyned with the strong propensity of nature, I might perhaps leave something so written to after-times, as they should not willingly let it die. These thoughts at once possessed me, and these other, that if I were certain to write as men buy leases, for three lives and downward, there ought no regard be sooner had, than to God's glory by the honour and instruction of my country. For which cause, and not only for that I knew it would be hard to arrive at the second rank among the Latines, I applied my selfe that resolution, which Ariosto followed against the perswasions of Bembo, to fix all the industry and art I could unite, to the adorning of my native tongue; not to make verbal curiosities the end; that were a toylsome vanity; but to be an interpreter and relater of the best and sagest things among mine own citizens throughout this island in the mother dialect. That what the greatest and choycest wits of Athens, Rome, or modern Italy, and those Hebrews of old did for their country, I in my proportion, with this over and above of being a Christian, might doe for mine, not caring to be once named abroad, though perhaps I could attaine to that; but content with these British islands as my world, whose fortune hath hitherto bin, that if the Athenians, as some say, made their small deeds great and renowned by their eloquent writers; England hath had her noble atchievements made small by the unskilful handling of monks and mechanicks. Time serves not now, and perhaps I might seem too profuse to give any certain account of what the mind at home in the spacious circuits of her musing hath liberty to propose to herself, though of highest hope and hardest attempting; whether that epick form, whereof the two poems of Homer, and those other two of Virgil and Tasso are a diffuse, and the book of Job a brief model. Or whether the rules of Aristotle herein are strictly to be kept, or nature to be followed; which in them, that know art, and use

use judgment, is no transgression, but an enriching of art. And lastly, what king or knight before the conquest might be chosen, in whom to lay the pattern of a christian heroe. And as Tasso gave to a prince of Italy his chois, whether he would command him to write of Godfrey's expedition against the infidels, or Belisarius against the Gothes, or Charlemain against the Lombards; if to the instinct of nature and the imbold'ning of art ought may be trusted, and that there be nothing aduers in our climate, or the fate of this age, it haply would be no rashnesse from an equal diligence and inclination to present the like offer in our own ancient stories. Or whether those dramattick constitutions, wherein Sophocles and Euripides raigue, shall be found more doctrinal and exemplary to a nation, the scripture also affords us a divine pastoral drama in the song of Salomon, consisting of two persons and a double chorus, as Origen rightly judges. And the Apocalips of St. John is the majestick image of a high and stately tragedy, shutting up and intermingling her solemn scenes and acts with a sevenfold chorus of Halleluja's and harping Symphonies: and this my opinion the grave authority of Pareus commenting that booke is sufficient to confirm. Or if occasion shall lead to imitat those magnific odes and hymns, wherein Pindarus and Callimachus are in most things worthy, some others in their frame judicious, in their matter most an end faulty; but those frequent songs throughout the law and prophets beyond all these, not in their divine argument alone, but in the very critical art of composition, may be easily made appear over all the kinds of lyrick poesie, to be incomparable. The thing, which I had to say, and those intentions, which have lived within me ever since I could conceive myself any thing worth to my cuntry, I return to crave excuse, that urgent reason hath pluckt from me by an abortive and fore-dated discovery. And the accomplishment of them lies not but in a power above man's to promise; but that none hath by more studious ways endeavoured, and with more unwearied spirit that none shall, that I dare almost averre of my self, as farre as life and free leasure will extend. Neither do I think it shame to covenant with any knowing reader, that for some few yeers yet I may go on trust with him toward the payment of what I am now indebted, as being a work not to be raised from the heat of youth, or the vapours of wine, like that which flows at wast from the pen of some vulgar amorist, or the trencher fury of a riming parasite; nor to be obtained by the invocation of dame Memory and her Siren daughters; but by devout prayer to that eternal spirit, who can enrich with all utterance and knowledge, and sends out his seraphim with the hallowed fire of his altar, to touch and purify the lips of whom he pleases. To this must be added industrious and select reading, steddy observation, insight into all seemly and generous arts and affaires; till which in some measure be compast, at mine own peril and cost I refuse not to sustain this expectation from as many, as are not loath to hazard so much credulity upon the best pledges, that I can give them."

Nor was this the last tract, which he published in the year 1641; for upon bishop Hall's printing "A Defence of the Humble Remonstrance against the frivolous and false exceptions of Smectymnuus; wherein the right of leiturgie and episcopacie is clearly vindicated from the vaine cavils and challenges of the answerers; by the author of the said humble remonstrance;" Milton wrote his animadversions upon the Remonstrant's defence against Smectymnuus, printed at London 1641 in 4to.

Soon after this there was published against this tract of our author's, "A modest confutation against a slanderous and scurrilous libel, which Milton tells us^a, was reported to be written by a son of bishop Hall. In this piece the writer having severely reflected on him, and represented him as having been expelled the university, and as being a frequenter of playhouses and the Bordelloes; Milton published at London 1642 in 4to, "An Apology against a pamphlet call'd, A modest confutation of the Animadversions

^a Apology for Smectymnuus, p. 21.

upon the Remonstrant against Smectymnuus;" or, as the title-page is in some copies, "An apology for Smectymnuus, with the reason of Church-Government." By John Milton, Gent."

During the time of his continuance in his house in Aldersgate-street, there happened several occasions of increasing his family. His father, who till the taking of Reading, in April 1643, by the earl of Essex's forces, had lived with his son Christopher at his house there, was then obliged to remove to his eldest son, with whom he lived for some years. He had likewise an addition of scholars^a; and in that year, in the 35th year of his age married Mary, the daughter of Richard Powell, Esq; of Forest-hill in Oxfordshire. "About Whitsuntide it was, or a little after, says Mr. Philips^b, that he took a journey into the country, no body about him certainly knowing the reason, or that it was any more than a journey of recreation. After a month's stay, home he returns a married man, who went out a batchelor, his wife being Mary, the eldest daughter of Mr. Richard Powell, then a justice of peace, of Forest-hill near Shotover in Oxfordshire; some few of her nearest relations accompanying the bride to her new habitation, which by reason the father nor any body else were yet come, was able to receive them; where the feasting held for some days in celebration of the nuptials and for entertainment of the bride's friends. At length they took their leave, and returning to Forest-hill, left the sister behind; probably not much to her satisfaction, as appeared by the sequel. By that time she had for a month or thereabout led a philosophical life, after having been used at home to a great house, and much company and joviality, her friends, possibly incited by her own desire, made earnest suit by letter, to have her company the remaining part of the summer; which was granted, on condition of her return at the time appointed, Michaelmas, or thereabout."

In the mean time came his father, and some of the forementioned scholars: and their course of studies was prosecuted with great vigour. Milton diverted himself sometimes in an evening in visiting the lady Margaret Leigh, daughter of the earl of Marlborough, lord high treasurer of England, and president of the privy council to king James I. This lady being a woman of admirable wit and good sense, had a particular esteem for our author, and took much delight in his company; as likewise did her husband, captain Hobson^c. And what regard Milton had for her, appears from a Sonnet, which he wrote to her, extant among his Occasional Poems^d.

Michaelmas being now come, and Milton receiving no account of his wife's return, he sent for her by letter, and having no answer, wrote several other letters, which were also unanswered; so that at last he dispatch'd a messenger with another letter, desiring her to return; but the messenger was dismissed with some kind of contempt. "This proceeding," says Mr. Philips^e, in all probability, was grounded upon no other cause but this, namely, that the family being generally addicted to the cavalier party, as they called it, and some of them possibly engaged in the king's service, who by this time had his head-quarters at Oxford, and was in some prospect of success; they began to repent them of having matched the eldest daughter of their family so contrary to them in opinion, and thought it would be a blot in their escutcheon, whenever that court should come to flourish again. However, it so incensed our author, that he thought it would be dishonourable ever to receive her again, after such a repulse; so that he forthwith prepared to fortify himself with arguments for such a resolution." He published therefore in 1644 in 4to, "The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce," without his name; "as not willing, says he^f, it should sway the reader either for me or against me. But when I was told, that the stile, which what it ailes to be so soon distinguishable, I cannot tell, was known by most men, and that some of the clergie began to inveigh and exclaim on what I was credibly inform'd they had not read, I took it for my proper

^a Philips, p. 21, 22.
London 1673.

^c P. 24.

^b Ibid. p. 18.

^e Philips, p. 23.
^f Preface to "The Judgment of Martin Bucer."

^d Sonnet x. p. 55. Edit.

season both to shew them a name, that could easily condemn such an indiscreet kind of censure, and to reinforce the question with a more accurat diligence." Accordingly he published a second edition of it the same year at London in 4to, under this title: "The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce restored to the good of both sexes, from the bondage of the canon law, and other mistakes, to the true meaning of scripture in the law and gospel compared. Wherein also are set down the bad consequences of punishing or condemning of sin that, which the law of God allowes, and Christ abolisht not. Now the second time revised and much augmented. In two books. To the parliament of England, with the assembly. The author J. M." The grand position, which he maintains in this treatise is, "That indisposition, unfitness, or contrariety of mind, arising from a cause in nature unchangeable, hindering and ever likely to hinder the main benefits of conjugal society, which are solace and peace, is a greater reason of divorce than natural frigidity; especially if there be no children, and that there be mutual consent." The same year he published at London in 4to, "The Judgment of Martin Bucer concerning Divorce. Written to Edward the sixth, in his second book of the kingdom of Christ. And now Englisht. Wherin a late book restoring the 'Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce' is heer confirmed and justified by the authoritie of Martin Bucer. To the parliament of England. Publisht by authoritie." In 1645 he published at London in 4to, "Tetrachordon: Expositions upon the foure chief places in scripture, which treat of marriage, or nullities in marriage, on Gen. i, 27, 28. compared and explained by Gen. ii. 18, 23, 24. on Deut. xxiv. 1, 2. on Matth. v. 31, 32. with Matth. xix. from the 3d v. to the 11th, on 1 Cor. vii. from the 10th to the 16th. Wherein the doctrine and discipline of divorce, as was lately published, is confirmed by the explanation of scripture, by testimony of ancient fathers, of civill lawes in the primitive church, of famousst reformed divines, and lastly, by an intended act of the parliament and church of England in the last of Edward VI. By the former author J. M."

On the first appearance of "the Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce" the clergy were extremely offended at it, and daily solicited the parliament to pass a censure upon it; and at last one of them, in a sermon before the parliament on a day of humiliation in August 1644, told them, that there was a wicked book abroad, which deserved to be burnt; and that among their other sins they ought to repent, that it had not yet been branded with a mark of their displeasure^a. And Mr. Wood tells us^b, that upon Milton's publishing his three books of Divorce, "the assembly of divines, then sitting at Westminster, took special notice of them; and thereupon, though the author had obliged them by his pen in his defence of Smectymnuus and other their controversies had with the bishops, they impatient of having the clergy's jurisdiction (as they reckoned it) invaded, did, instead of answering or disproving what these books had asserted, cause him to be summoned before the house of lords. But that house whether approving the doctrine, or not favouring his accuser, did soon dismiss him."

His treatise of Divorce was immediately attacked by a piece intituled, "Divorce at Pleasure," and by another printed at London 1644 in 4to, and intituled, "An Answer to a Book, intituled, 'The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, or, a plea for ladies and gentlemen, and all other married women against divorce. Wherein both sexes are vindicated from all bondage of canon law, and other mistakes whatsoever; and the unsound principles of the author are examined and fully confuted by authority of holy scripture, the laws of the land, and sound reason.'" Mr. Joseph Caryl, a presbyterian divine, who wrote a very voluminous commentary on the book of Job, gave on the 14th of November 1644, his Imprimatur to this piece in the following words: "To preserve the strength of the marriage-bond, and the honour of that estate, against those sad breaches and dangerous abuses of it, which common discontents (on this side adultery) are likely

^a Milton's preface to his Tetrachordon:

^b Col. 264.

to make in unstaied minds and men given to change, by taking in or grounding themselves upon the opinion answered, and with good reason confuted in this treatise, I have approved the printing and publishing of it." In this piece the author^a styles Milton's book "a frothie discourse," and tells us, that "were it not sugred over with a little neat language, it would appear so immeritous and undeserving, so contrary to all humane learning, yea truth and common experience itself, that all that reade it, must needs count it worthie to be burnt by the hangman." In answer to this piece, Milton published at London 1645, in 4to, "Colasterion: A Reply to a nameles Answer against 'The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce.' Wherein the trivial author of that answer is discovered, the licencer conferred with, and the opinion which they traduce, defended. By the former author, J. M." In this book he complains, that when his "Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce" had been "a whole year published the second time with many arguments added, and the former ones better'd and confirm'd," the Answer above-mentioned was directed only against the first edition. And he tells us, that the author of that Answer was a "Servingman turned Sollicitor" assisted by a young divine or two. He treats his antagonist with great contempt; but concludes with observing, that "as for the subject itself, which I have writt, and now defend, according as the opposition beares, if any man equal to the matter shall think it appertains him to take in hand this controversy, either excepting against ought writt'n, or perswaded hee can shew better how this question of such moment to be thoroughly known may receav a true determination, not leaning on the old and rott'n suggestions, whereon it yet leans, if his intents bee sincere to the public, and shall carry him without bitterness to the opinion, or to the person dissenting; let him not, I intreate him, guesse by the handling, which meritoriously hath been bestowed on this object of contempt and laughter, that I account it any displeasure don mee to bee contradicted in print; but as it leads to the attainment of any thing more true, shall esteem it a benefit, and shall know how to return his civility and faire argument in such a sort, as he shall confesse that to doe so is my choise, and to have don thus was my chance." This subject having been thoroughly examined by our author, occasioned him to be consulted after the restoration by an eminent peer, in a very considerable post, while a bill was depending in 1668, in the house of lords, where it afterwards passed, for a divorce of John lord Ross, afterwards earl of Rutland, from his lady, Anne, eldest daughter and coheir of Henry Pierrepont, marquis of Dorchester, to whom he had been married in 1658^b.

But the treatment which Milton received, on account of his writings on that subject, contributed perhaps not a little to prejudice him against the presbyterians, for whom he had at first shewn himself so strenuous an advocate, and he absolutely renounced their interests, as soon as he discovered how averse most of them were to liberty of conscience, which was always his favourite principle; and he shewed his indignation of their tyranny in a copy of verses, entitled, "On the new Forcers of Conscience." He wrote likewise two sonnets upon the reception, which his books of divorce had met with; in the latter of which he hath these excellent lines upon the mere pretenders to liberty,

"That rail for freedom in their senseless mood,
 "And still revolt, when truth would set them free.
 "Licence they mean, when they cry *Liberty*;
 "For who loves that, must first be wise and good."

About this time he was solicited by several gentlemen of his acquaintance, to take upon him the education of their sons, his great success in his first undertaking of that kind being known. Upon this he hir'd a larger house, than that in which he then

^a P. 41.

^b Wood's Fasti, Oxon. Vol. 1. Col. 264.

lived; but in the interval before he removed into it, there fell out, as we learn from Mr. Philips^a, a passage, which though it altered not the whole course he was going to steer, yet it put a stop or rather an end to a grand affair, which was more than probably thought to be then in agitation. It was indeed a design of marrying one of Dr. Davis's daughter's, a very handsome and witty gentlewoman, but averse, as it is said, to this motion. However the intelligence hereof, and the then declining state of the king's cause, and consequently of the circumstances of Mr. Powell's family, caused them to set all engines on work to restore the late married woman to the station, wherein they a little before had placed her. At last this device was pitched upon. There dwelt in the lane of St. Martin's-le Grand, which was hard by, a relation of our author's, one Blackborough, whom it was known, he often visited; and upon this occasion the visits were the more narrowly observed, and possibly there might be a combination between both parties; the friends on both sides concentrating in the same action, though on different behalfs. One time above the rest, he making his usual visit, the wife was ready in another room, and on a sudden he was surprized to see one, whom he thought to have never seen more, making submission, and begging pardon on her knees before him. He might probably at first make some shew of aversion and rejection; but partly his own generous nature, more inclinable to a reconciliation than to perseverance in anger and revenge, and partly the strong intercession of friends on both sides, soon brought him to an act of oblivion, and a firm league of peace for the future. And it was at length concluded, that she should remain at a friend's house till such time as he was settled in his new house in Barbican, and all things for her reception in order. The place agreed on for her present abode was the widow Webber's house in St. Clement's-church-yard, whose second daughter had been married to the other brother many years before. The first fruits of her return to her husband was a daughter, born July 29, 1646. within a year after; though whether by ill constitution, or want of care, she grew more and more decrepit." It is not to be doubted^b, but the above-mentioned interview between Milton and his wife must wonderfully affect him; and perhaps the impression which it made on his imagination, contributed much to the painting of that pathetic scene in "Paradise Lost, B. x. v. 909." in which Eve addresses herself to Adam for pardon and peace. After this re-union, so far was Milton from retaining an unkind memory of the provocations, which he had received from her ill conduct, that he entertained her father and several of her brothers and sisters in his house till after his own father's death^c.

His tractate "of Education," was written about 1644, and printed at first in one sheet in 4to, and inscribed to Mr. Samuel Hartlib, a gentleman of universal learning, and public spirit; to whom Mr. William Petty, afterwards Sir William, wrote likewise a piece upon the same subject, printed at London 1647, in 4to, under the following title, "Advice to Mr. Samuel Hartlib for the advancement of some particular parts of learning;" and Mr. John Durie another to the same purpose, printed at London 1651, in 8vo, with this title: "The reformed school, and the reformed librarie-keeper, by John Durie."

The same year 1644, our author's Areopagitica: "A speech of Mr. John Milton for the liberty of unlicenced printing, to the parliament of England," was published at London in 4to, in November, as appears from a manuscript note on one of the copies presented by him to a friend. This piece as well as that upon Education, is written with greater purity and less affectation of style, than his first works in prose, and it is the strongest vindication, that ever appeared in age or language, of the liberty of the press, which is the basis of all other. But it had not the proper effect upon the presbyterians, who had at that time the ascendant, and were as tenacious of continuing the restraints upon others, as they had been loud in their complaints of them, when

^a P. 25, 26, 27.

^c Philips, p. 27.

^b Fenton's life of Milton, p. 3. prefixed to Paradise Lost, Edit. London 1727 in 8vo.

imposed upon themselves. Mr. Toland indeed affirms^a, that such was the effect of this piece of our author "that the following year, Mabot, a licenser, offered reasons against licensing, and at his own request was discharged that office." But this assertion contains two mistakes; for the licenser's name was not Mabot, but Gilbert Mabbot, who continued in his office till May 22. 1649, when, as Mr. Whitelocke observes^b, "upon his desire, and reasons against licensing of books to be printed, he was discharged of that employment." And we find a particular account of the affair in a weekly paper, printed in 4to, and intitled, "A perfect diurnall of some passages in parliament, and the daily proceedings of the army under his excellency the lord Fairfax. From Munday May 21, to Munday May 28, 1649. Collected for the satisfaction of such as desire to be truly informed. N^o 304." In which, under Tuesday May 22. p. 2531, we read as follows: "Mr. Mabbot hath long desired several members of the house, and lately the councill of State, to move the house, that he might be discharged of licencing books for the future upon the reasons following, viz.

I. Because many thousand of scandalous and malignant pamphlets have been published with his name thereunto, as if he had licensed the same (though he never saw them) on purpose (as he conceives) to prejudice him in his reputation amongst the honest party of this nation.

II. Because that employment (as he conceives) is unjust and illegall, as to the ends of its first institution, viz. to stop the presse for publishing any thing, that might discover the corruption of church and state in the time of popery, episcopacy, and tyranny, the better to keep the people in ignorance, and carry on their popish, factious, and tyrannical designs, for the enslaving and destruction both of the bodies and souls of all the free people of this nation.

III. Because licencing is as great a monopoly as ever was in this nation, in that all men's judgments, reasons, &c. are to be bound up in the licenser's (as to licensing;) for if the author of any sheete, booke, or treatise, wrote not to please the fancy, and come within the compasse of the licenser's judgment, then hee is not to receive any stamp of authority for publishing thereof.

IV. Because it is lawfull (in his judgment) to print any booke, sheete, &c. without licensing, so as the authors and printers do subscribe their true names thereunto, that so they may be liable to answer the contents thereof; and if they offend therein, then to be punished by such lawes, as are or shall be for those cases provided.

A committee of the councill of state being satisfied with these and other reasons of M. Mabbot concerning licensing, the council of state reports to the house; upon which the house ordered this day, that the said M. Mabbot should be discharged of licensing books for the future.

In 1645, our author's juvenile poems appeared under the following title: "Poems of Mr. John Milton, both English and Latin, composed at several times. Printed by his true copies. The Songs were set in Musick by Mr. Henry Lawes, Gentleman of the king's chapel, and one of his majesties private musick. Printed and published according to order. London printed by Ruth Raworth, for Humphrey Mosely, and are to be sold at the signe of the Princes-Arms in St. Pauls Church-yard, 1645, in 12mo." The title of the Latin poems is as follows: "Joannis Miltoni Londinensis poemata. Quorum pleraque intra annum ætatis vigesimum conscripsit. Nunc primum edita." To this edition is prefixed the following preface of Humphry Mosely the stationer, to the reader. "It is not any private respect of gain, gentle reader, for the slightest pamphlet is now adayes more vendible then the works of learnedest men; but it is the

^a P. 23.

^b Memorials p. 403. Edit. London, 1732.

love I have to our own language, that hath made me diligent to collect and set forth such peeces both in prose and vers, as may renew the wonted honour and esteem of our English tongue : and it's the worth of these both English and Latin poems, not the flourish of any prefixed encomions, that can invite thee to buy them, though these are not without the highest commendations and applause of the learnedest academies both domestick and forreign ; and among those of our own countrey, the unparalleled Provost of Eaton, Sir Henry Wootton. I know not thy palate, how it relishes such dainties, nor how harmonious thy soul is ; perhaps more trivial airs may please thee better. But howsoever thy opinion is spent upon these, that encouragement I have already received from the most ingenious men in their clear and courteous entertainment of Mr. Waller's late choice peeces, hath once more made me adventure into the world, presenting it with these ever-green, and not to be blasted laurels. The author's more peculiar excellency in these studies was too well known to conceal his papers, or to keep me from attempting to solicit them from him. Let the event guide itself which way it will, I shall deserve of the age by bringing it into the light as true a birth as the muses have brought forth since our famous Spenser wrote, whose poems in these English ones are as rarely imitated, as sweetly excelled. Reader, if thou art eagle-eyed to censure their worth, I am not fearfull to expose them to thy exactest perusal." This edition contains the following poems : " On the morning of Christ's nativity, composed 1629. The Hymn. A paraphrase on Psalm cxiv. Psalm cxxxvi. The Passion. On Time. Upon the circumcision. At a solemn musick. An epitaph on the marchioness of Winchester. Song on May-morning. On Shakespear, 1630. On the University-carrier, who sickn'd in the time of his vacancy, being forbid to go to London, by reason of the plague. Another on the same. L'Allegro. Il Penseroso. X Sonnets. Arcades, Part of an entertainment presented to the countess dowager of Darby at Harefield by some noble persons of her family. Lycidas : in this monody the author bewailes a learned friend unfortunately drown'd in his passage from Chester on the Irish seas, 1637 ; and by occasion foretels the ruine of our corrupted clergy then in their height. A mask presented at Ludlow-castle, 1634, before the earl of Bridgwater, then president of Wales." Among the Latin poems are contained all that are published in the edition of his " Poems, &c. upon severall Occasions, at London 1673, in 8vo, except Apologus de Rustico & Hero ; and Ad Joannem Rousium Oxoniensis academix bibliothecarium, de libro poematum amisso, quem ille sibi denuo mitti postulabat, ut cum alias nostris in Bibliotheca publicâ reponerit, Ode ; dated Jan. 23, 1646." To the edition of 1645 is prefixed the author's picture, with the following Greek epigram under it written by himself ; in which he ridicules Wm. Marshal, the Engraver, for his ill performance, and the unlikeness of the picture to the original.

Ἀμαθὲι γεγράφθαι χειρὶ τήνδε μὲν εἰκόνα
Φαίης τάχ' ἂν, πρὸς εἶδος αὐτοφύες βλέπων.
Τὸν δ' ἐκτυπωτὸν ἔκ ἐπιγναντες φίλοι,
Γελάτε φάυλα δυσμίμημα ζωγράφου.

Upon the death of his father, his wife's relations returning to their severall habitations, " his house look'd again, like a house of the Muses " only, though the accession of scholars was not great. Possibly his proceeding thus far in the education of youth may have been the occasion of some of his adversaries calling him pedagogue and school-master ; whereas it is well known, he never set up for a public school to teach all the young fry of a parish ; but only was willing to impart his learning and knowledge to relations, and

the sons of gentlemen, who were his intimate friends; and that neither his converse, nor his writings, nor his manner of teaching ever favoured in the least any thing of pedantry. And probably he might have some prospect of putting in practice his academical institution, according to the model laid down in his sheet "of Education;" the Progress of which design was afterwards diverted by a series of alteration in the affairs of state. For I am much mistaken, says Mr. Philips, if there was not about this time a design of making him adjutant-general in Sir William Waller's army; but the new modelling of the army soon following^a, prov'd an obstruction to that design."

Soon after the march of Fairfax and Cromwell in April 1647. with the whole army through the city in order to suppress the insurrection, which Brown and Massey were endeavouring to raise there against the army's proceedings, he left his great house in Barbican for a smaller in High-Holborn, which opened backward into Lincoln's-Inn-Fields; where he prosecuted his studies, till after the king's trial and death, when the form of government being now changed into a commonwealth, and the presbyterians declaring their abhorrence of the king's execution, and asserting, that his person was sacred and inviolable, Milton published, "The Tenure of kings and magistrates; proving that it is lawfull, and hath been held so through all ages, for any who have the power, to call to account a tyrant or wicked king, and, after due conviction, to depose and put him to death, if the ordinary magistrate have neglected or denied to do it; and that they, who of late so much blame deposing, are the men that did it themselves. The author J. M." Wood supposes^b, that this piece was written before king Charles I's death; but Milton himself assures us^c, that it was not published till after it, and even then, with a view rather to compose the minds of the people, than to determine any thing with relation to that prince: "Liber iste," says he, "non nisi post mortem regis prodit, ad componendos potius hominum animos factus, quam ad statuendum de Carolo quicquam, quod non mei, sed magistratuum intererat, & peractum jam tum erat." And I find by a MS. Note in a printed copy of this book, that it was published in February 1648-9.

Not long after this he wrote and published his "observation upon the articles of peace, which the marquis of Ormonde had concluded at Kilkenny January 17th, 1648-9. in the king's name and by his authority, with the popish Irish rebels." He added some remarks on a letter, which his lordship had sent to Colonel Jones, Governor of Dublin, in order to persuade him to revolt from the parliament. He animadverted likewise upon the representation of the Scots presbytery at Belfast in Ireland, dated February 15, 1648-9, in which they declared their abhorrence of the death of the king, the breach of the covenant, and the toleration of the different persuasions.

After this, he applied himself to his own private studies, and had already finished four books of his history of England, when he was taken into the service of the commonwealth, and made Latin secretary to the Council of state;^d who had resolved, neither to write to others abroad, nor to receive any answers, except in the Latin tongue, which was common to them all^e.

He had not long discharged the business of his office, when he was ordered to write an Answer to the *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*, which had been published immediately after king Charles the First's death, under his majesty's name. Milton's answer was printed at London, in 1649, in 4to, under the following title: "ΕΙΚΟΝΟΚΛΑΣΤΗΣ, in answer to a book intitled ΕΙΚΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ, The portraiture of his sacred majesty in his solitudes and sufferings. The author J. M. Published by Authority." There is a

^a This model of the army took place about April 1645. See Whitelock's memorials, p. 140, Edit. London 1732. ^b Col. 264, 265. ^c Defensio secunda, p. 93. Edit. 1654. ^d Miltoni Defensio secunda, p. 94. Edit. 1654. ^e Philips, p. 30.

French Translation of it printed at London in 12mo, under the following title: 'EIKONOKΛΑΣΤΗΣ, ou Reponse au Livre intitulé "EIKΩN BΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ", ou le Pourtraict de sa sacrée Majesté durant sa solitude & ses souffrances. Par le Sr. Jean Milton." Traduite de l'Anglois sur la seconde & plus ample Edition, & revûë par l'Auteur. A laquelle sont ajoutées diverses pieces mentionnées en la dite Reponse pour la plus grande Commodité du Lecteur. A Londres par Guill. Du-Gard, Imprimeur du Conseil d'Etat, l'an 1652. It was answered in a book printed 1651, pag. 267. in 4to. under the following title: "EIKΩN AKΛΑΣΤΟΣ: The Image unbroaken. A perspective of the impudence, falshood, vanitie, and prophannes, published in a libell intituled, EIKONOKΛΑΣΤΗΣ against EIKΩN BΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ, or the portraicture of his sacred Majestie in his solitudes and Sufferings." And upon the reprinting our author's book at Amsterdam 1690, in 8vo, there was published at London 1692, in 8vo, "Vindiciæ Carolinæ: Or, a Defence of "Εικων Βασιλική, the Portraicture of his sacred Majesty in his solitudes and sufferings. In a Reply to a Book intituled, "Εικονοκλάσης, written by Mr. Milton, and lately reprinted at Amsterdam."

Our author, in his "Εικονοκλάσης, threw out some suspicions of the king's not being the author of the "Εικων Βασιλική. But his majesty's claim to it was generally admitted, till the point came to be agitated, upon occasion of a memorandum, said to be found in 1686, by Millington the auctioneer, in a vacant page of a printed copy of that book, and supposed to be written by Arthur, the first Earl of Anglesey. The evidence on both sides of the question was collected by me, and laid before the public with the utmost sincerity and impartiality, in an "Appendix" to the former Edition of this Life in 1738, except that I forgot there to mention, that bishop Burnet assures us in the History of his own Times^a, that the earl of Lothian, who knew king Charles I. very well, and loved him little, seemed confident, that it was his majesty's own hand, his lordship declaring to the bishop, that he had heard the king say a great many of the things, that he found in that book: But that on the other hand, the Duke of York in 1673, told him, that "Εικων was not of his father's writing; but Dr. Gauden's, who, after the restoration, brought the duke of Somerset and the earl of Southampton, to king Charles II. and the duke of York, and that those noble persons affirmed, that it was written by that divine, and carried down by the earl of Southampton, and shewed to king Charles I. during the treaty of Newport, who read it, and approved of it, as containing his sense of things. To which may now be added, that Dr. Patrick, bishop of Ely, in his manuscript "History of his own Life," though attached in the younger part of his life to the interest of king Charles I. denies his majesty to have been the original author of the "Εικων^b. In the course of the controversy about the book, Milton's charge upon the king of borrowing the prayer of Pamela from Sir Philip Sidney's Arcadia, inserted in some editions of the "Εκων, was retorted upon himself, as if that prayer had been added by his contrivance, who in conjunction with Serjeant Bradshaw, had prevailed upon Du Gard the printer to insert it, in order to cast a disgrace upon the king, and blast the reputation of the Icon. This supposed fact was advanced chiefly upon the authority of Henry Hills the printer, who had frequently affirmed it to Dr. Gill and Dr. Bernard his physicians, as they testified. But Hills was not himself the printer, who was dealt with in this manner, and consequently he could have the story only from hearsay; and though he was Cromwell's printer, yet afterwards he turned papist in the reign of king James II. in order to be that king's printer; and it was at that time, that he used to relate this story. Besides which it is highly improbable, that Milton and Bradshaw should make him their confident unnecessarily in such an affair; and laugh in his presence at their imposing such a cheat upon the world; or that he should conceal

^a Vol. I. p. 51.^b Whiston's Memoirs of his Life, p. 353.

it during the life of the former, who survived the restoration so many years. So that such a testimony from such a person is not to be admitted against a man, who, as his learned and ingenious editor observes^a, had a soul above being guilty of so mean an action.

In 1650, there was published at London in 4to. pag. 22. a piece, intitled, "The grand case of conscience concerning the engagement stated and resolved, Or, A strict survey of the solemn league and covenant in reference to the present engagement." Mr. Wood tells us^b that Milton was thought to be the author of it; but the stile and manner of writing do not the least favour that supposition.

His most celebrated work in prose is his "Pro populo Anglicano Defensio contra Claudii Anonymi alias Salmasii Defensionem Regiam: Printed at London 1651, in Fol. It was written upon this occasion. King Charles II. had engaged Claudius Salmasius by a present of an hundred Jacobusses, to write a Defence of his father, the late king; which defence was printed in 1649, with this title; "Defensio Regia pro Carolo I. ad Carolum II." Salmasius was at that time an honorary professor at the university of Leyden, and eminent for his "Plinianæ Exercitationes in Solinum, and other critical writings, and is allowed to have been a man of the most extensive learning of any in that age, Grotius himself speaking of his "consummatissima Eruditio"; though, as Herman Conringius observes^c, his "Defensio Regia" did not answer the expectation conceived of it, and he was always remarkable for an haughtiness of temper and virulency of stile, and for the strength of his memory, more than that of his judgment, or the reasoning, method, or elegance of his writings. Claudius Sarravius, counsellor in the parliament of Paris, and an intimate friend of Salmasius, in a letter to him dated at Paris, Feb. 18, 1650^d, expresses his surprize, that he should write in the preface to his Defensio, with so much zeal in defence of the bishops of England, when he had in another work of his "de Presbyteris & Episcopis," printed at Leyden 1641, in 8vo, under the fictitious name of Wallo Messalinus, attacked them with the utmost acrimony; which he observes might expose him to the imputation of a Time-server, who paid no regard to truth itself. "Hoc sanè dicent esse τῷ καιρῷ δαλεῦειν potius quam τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πείθεσθαι. And in another letter^e, dated at Paris March 5, of the same year, he reminds him of this inconsistency, which would make his sincerity questioned. "De Necessitate episcopatus Anglicani quod obiter dixeras in Præfatione, uti jam monui, fortius adhuc urges ipso opere, contra dictata Wallonis Messalini; quod tibi vitio vertetur, diceturque te calidum & frigidum eodem ex ore efflare, nec generositati tuæ id convenire existimabitur." Salmasius having wrote an answer to Sarravius upon this point, the latter replied to him thus in a letter dated March 12th, 1650. "Te ergo habemus reum fatentem, &c. i. e. "We have now your own confession of your fault; for it is the same thing to us, whether you adapt yourself to the times or to the cause. But before this, it was said, that you was a man of an inflexible disposition, who, like the God Terminus, would not give way to Jove himself. Besides, I am of opinion, that even a king's advocate ought not, in his master's cause, to speak in public differently from what he speaks and thinks in private; as the laws which we use in private life, are not at all different from those, upon which decrees are made in courts of judicature. But you wrote, you say, "By Command." And was it possible for any commands to prevail on you to change your opinion? Your favourite Epictetus tells us, that our opinion is one of those things in our power, and so far in our power, that nothing can take it away from us without our consent." As soon as Salmasius book appeared in England, the council of state unanimously appointed Milton, who was pre-

^a Life of Milton, by Tho. Newton, D. D. p. 31. 2d Edit. 8vo.

Stobæi Florileg. Edit. Paris 1623.

^d De Regno Anglorum.

^b Col. 265.

^c Not. ad

Sarravii Epistolæ ex Bibliothecâ Gudianâ auctiores, p. 224. Edit. Utrecht 1697, in 4to.

^e See Burman's Edition of Claudii

^f Ibid. p. 226.

sent,

sent, to answer it^a. Mr. Bayle observes^b, that Milton's *Defensio* "made him talked of every where: that it shews him to have been a master of the Latin tongue; that his style is flowing, lively, and elegant; and that he has defended the enemies to monarchy with great skill and ingenuity; but that he has treated the subject in too ludicrous a manner." It was burnt at Paris, not by order of the parliament, but that of the lieutenant civil; and at Toulouse by the hands of the common hangman^c: but this served to procure it more readers; and it is certain, that it was read every where with the utmost attention, as Mr. Ziegler assures us in the Preface to his "*Exercitationes ad Regicidium Anglorum*." And the author of the "*Apologia pro rege & populo Anglicano contra Johannis Polypragmatici (alias Miltoni Angli) Defensionem destructivam regis & populi Anglicani*," complains, that it was with the utmost difficulty, that one edition of Salmasius's book could be procured, while that of Milton was printed several times: "Quod ornatissimus Salmasius ad tuendum jus & honorem Caroli Britanniae Monarchae, sceleratorum manibus interfecti, prudenter scripserat, unâ tantum impressione, idque magnâ cum difficultate in lucem erupit, tanto odio hisce ultimis temporibus veritatem mundus persequitur. Sed quod scelestissimus Miltonus, ad lacerandam famam Regis defuncti, & subvertendum in subditos dominium hæreditarium, invidiose elaboravit, illius tot sunt exemplaria, ut nescio cui Lectorem remitterem, sic mendaciorum & convitiolorum amore flagrant homines^d." Milton was likewise, on the first appearance of this book, visited or invited by all the ambassadors at London, not excepting even those from princes; and was particularly esteemed by Adrian Paaw, ambassador from the "United Provinces." He was highly complimented at the same time by letters from the most ingenious persons in Germany and France^e; and Leonard Philaras, an Athenian born, and ambassador from the duke of Parma to the king of France, wrote a fine commendation of his Defence, and sent him his picture, as appears from Milton's letter to Philaras, dated at London in June 1652. But what gave him the highest satisfaction, was the approbation of the parliament, who had employed him, and rewarded his performance with a present of a thousand pounds.^f

The contempt and severity, with which he has treated Salmasius, have been censured by many persons; and can only be extenuated from the insolence of his antagonist towards the whole English nation, and the manner of controversy in that age, and the privilege of the Latin language, in which a licence was indulged, which would been insupportable to a delicate ear in a modern language. The English reader will therefore have much less relish for the translation of this work by Mr. Washington of the Temple, printed at London, 1692, in 8vo. than those, who are capable of reading the original, where the force and beauty of the style is superior perhaps to that of any performance since the Augustan age.

The year after its first publication, Sir Robert Filmer, the advocate for absolute monarchy, upon the hypothesis of patriarchal power, and who afterwards received more honour from the confutation of Mr. Locke, than from his own works, animadverted upon our author in a piece, printed at London, 1651, in 4to, under the title of "*Observations concerning the originall of government, upon Mr. Hobbes's Leviathan; Mr. Milton against Salmasius; H. Grotius de Jure Belli*."

Salmasius made a great figure at this time in the Swedish court, where he had resided from about September 1650, being invited thither by queen Christina, who had paid the same compliment to all the most eminent men of learning in Europe. But no sooner had Milton's "*Defence of the people of England*" reached Sweden, but it had a fatal effect upon his adversary's reputation there. It was brought about the beginning of

^a Miltoni *Defensio secunda*, p. 95. Edit. 1654.

^c Miltoni *Defensio secunda* p. 127.

Lectorem.

^d *Apologia pro Rege & Populo Anglicano, &c.* In *Monito ad*

^e Miltoni *Defensio secunda*, p. 129, 130. Edit. 1654.

^b *Hist. and Critical Dictionary*, Article of Milton.

^f Toland, p. 32.

April, 1651. to Isaac Vossius, afterwards canon of Windsor, then at Stockholm; who owns, that he had not expected such a performance from an Englishman, and acquaints his friend Nicholas Heinsius, that the queen had immediately borrowed it of him, and was highly pleased with it, commending both the genius of the author, and his manner of writing. But Salmasius was so infatuated by his resentment, that with an impotent arrogance he threatened to destroy the author and the whole parliament^a. Vossius being curious from an admiration of the work, to know the character and circumstances of the writer, consulted on those heads his uncle Francis Junius, the author of the celebrated Treatise "*De pictura Veterum*," who resided in England, and was very intimate with Milton; and Junius informed him of his being of a gentleman's family, and that he was skilled in many languages; polite, affable, and endowed with many other virtues^b. Heinsius, in his answer to Vossius from Holland, expresses his surprise, that only a single copy of Milton's book was brought to Stockholm, when there had been sent thither, one to the queen, another to Vossius, which he had received, and a third to Salmasius himself; and adds, that the book was in every body's hands, there having been four editions of it in a few months, besides the English one, and that a Dutch translation was handed about, and a French one expected. Vossius afterwards writes from Stockholm, on the 31st of January, 1652-3, that Salmasius was then wholly employed in answering Milton; that his book was begun to be printed, and would be equal in size to his "*Defensio Regia*;" that he every where treated Milton as having prostituted his person in Italy, to the most unnatural purposes, for the most contemptible sums; and criticises his verses^c. Heinsius in his answer dated at Venice, the 27th of February following, writes, that Holstenius had lent him Milton's Latin poems, which he thought nothing, when compared with the elegance of his Defence, being frequently defective in point of Prosody; which would afford great scope for Salmasius's criticisms, though he had no right to object to the verses of another, when nothing could be more contemptible than his own. But that with regard to the imputation upon Milton's behaviour in Italy, it was a mere calumny; for on the contrary he was disliked by the Italians, among whom he lived a considerable time, by the reason of severity of his manners, and the liberty, which he took in disputing about religion, and inveighing against the Pope upon all occasions^d. And in others of his letters to Vossius and John Frederic Gronovius from Holland, Heinsius mentions Salmasius's resentments against him, for commending Milton's book, and says, that Theodore Graswinkle had written a piece against Milton, which was intended to have been printed by Elzevir, but suppressed by public authority. Salmasius soon finding himself declining in the esteem of the queen of Sweden, thought proper to leave that kingdom in Sept. 1651, and died at Spa in Germany, Sept. 3. the year following. His reply to Milton did not appear till the year of the restoration, when it was printed at London in 24to, under the following title; "*Claudii Salmasii ad Joannem Miltonum Responsio, Opus posthumum*," with a dedication to king Charles II. by Salmasius's Son Claudius, dated at Dijon, Sept. 1, 1660. This Book is written with an unexampled virulence. He treats Milton as an ordinary school-master; "*Qui Ludimagister in scholâ triviali Londinensi fuit*"^e; and charges him with divorcing his wife after a year's marriage, for reasons best known to himself, and defending the lawfulness of divorce for any causes whatsoever^f. He styles him "*impura bellua, quæ nihil hominis sibi reliqui fecit præter lippientes oculos*"^g; and charges him with some false quantities in his Latin Juvenile poems^h; and throughout the whole book gives him the titles of *Bella*, *fanaticus latro*, *Homunculus*, *Lippulus*, *Cæculus*, *Homo perditissimus*, *Nebulo*, *impurus*, *scelestus audax & nefarius Alastor*, *infandus Impostor*, &c. and declares, that he would have him tortured with burning pitch or scalding oil till he expired: "*Pro*

^a Isaaci Vossii Epistol. ad Nicol. Heinsium, P. Burmanni Sylloge Epistol. Tom. III. p. 595, and 596.

^b Ibid. p. 618.

^c Ibid. p. 662.

^d Ibid. p. 669.

^e Salmasii Responsio, p. 3.

^f Ibid.

^g Ibid. p. 4.

^h Ibid. p. 5.

cæteris autem tuis factis dictisque dignum dicam videri, qui pice ardenti, vel oleo fervente, perfundaris, usque dum animam effles nocentem & carnifici jam pridem debitam."

A Latin piece published against our author in 1651, in 12mo. under the title of "Apologia pro rege & populo Anglicano contra Johannis Polypragmatici (alias Miltoni Angli) Defensionem destructivam regis & populi Anglicani," was ascribed by some to Mr. Joseph Jane^b, a lawyer of Gray's-Inn; and by others to Dr. John Bramhall, bishop of Derry, made archbishop of Armagh in Ireland after the restoration. But Mr. Wood is of opinion^c, that there was no ground to imagine it to have been the performance of that prelate; as indeed it was very improbable, that a piece written in so barbarous a Latin stile, and so full of Solecisms, could come from the hands of a man of such distinguished abilities and learning. "But whoever the author was, the Book was thought fit to be taken into correction; and our author not thinking it worth his own undertaking, to the disturbing the progress of whatever more chosen work he had then in his hands, committed this task to Mr. John Philips, the youngest of his nephews, but with such exact emendations before it went to the press, that it might very well have passed for his, but that he was willing the person, who took the pains to prepare it for his examination and improvement, should have the name and credit of being the author^d." It was printed at London in 1652, under this title; "Joannis Philippi Angli responsio ad Apologiam anonymi cujusdam Tenebrionis pro rege & populo Anglicano infantissimam." In this book bishop Bramhall is treated with great severity as the author of the Apology.

During the writing and publishing of this book, Milton lodged at one Thomson's next door to the Bull head Tavern at Charing-cross, opening into the Spring-garden; which appears to have been only a lodging taken, till his designed apartment in Scotland-yard was prepared for him; for hither he soon removed, and here his third child, a son, was born, who, March 16, 1650. thro' the ill usage or bad constitution of the nurse, died an infant. From this apartment, whether he thought it not healthy, or otherwise inconvenient for his use, he soon removed to a garden-house in Petty-France in Westminster, next door to the lord Scudamore's, and opening into St. James's Park; where he remained eight years, viz. from the year 1652 till within a few weeks of the restoration. In this house his first wife dying in childbed^e, he married a second, Catherine, the daughter of captain Woodcock of Hackney, who within a year died also in childbed, and was about a month after followed by her child, which was a girl^f. Upon the death of this wife he wrote the following beautiful sonnet:

Methought I saw my late espoused faint
Brought to me like Alcestis from the grave,
Whom Jove's great son to her glad husband gave,
Rescued from death by force, though pale and faint.
Mine, as whom washt from spot of child-bed taint,
Purification in the old law did save,
And such, as yet once more I trust to have
Full sight of her in Heaven without restraint,
Came vested all in white, pure as her mind:
Her face was veil'd, yet to my fancied sight,
Love, sweetness, goodness in her person shin'd
So clear, as in no facee with more delight.
But O! as to embrace me she inclined,
I wak'd, she fled, and day brought back my night.

^a Ibid p 11.

^e Ibid. p. 33.

^b Philips, p. 32.

^f Id. p. 33, and 41.

^c Athen. Oxon. Vol. II. Col. 1118.

^s Id. p. 33, 34.

^d Philips, p. 32.

This second marriage was about two or three years after his being wholly deprived of his sight; for by reason of his continual studies, and the head-ach, to which he was subject from his youth, and his perpetual tampering with physick, his eyes had been decaying for twelve years before, and the sight of one for a long time intirely lost.^a In his "Defensio secunda"^b he tells us himself, that when he was enjoined by public authority to write his defence of the people of England against Salmasius, he was in an ill state of health, and the sight of one eye was almost lost already, the physicians declaring, that he would lose the other, if he should attempt that work. In a letter of his to Leonard Philaras, envoy from the duke of Parma to the king of France, dated at Westminster, September 28, 1654, he gives a particular account of the manner, in which he lost his sight; which we shall give an extract of in Mr. Richardson's translation.^c "Since you advised me not to fling away all hopes of recovering my sight, for that you have a friend at Paris, Thevenot, the physician, particularly famous for the eyes, whom you offer to consult in my behalf, if you receive from me an account, by which he may judge of the cause and symptoms of my disease; I will do what you advise me to, that I may not seem to refuse any assistance, that is offered, perhaps from God. I think 'tis about ten years, more or less, since I began to perceive, that my eye-sight grew weak and dim; and at the same time my spleen and bowels to be oppressed and troubled with Flatus; and in the morning, when I began to read, according to my custom, my eyes grew painful immediately, and to refuse reading, but were refreshed after a moderate exercise of the body. A certain Iris began to surround the light of the candle, if I looked at it; soon after which, on the left part of the left eye (for that was some years sooner clouded) a mist arose, which hid every thing on that side; and looking forward, if I shut my right eye, objects appeared smaller. My other eye also, for these last three years, failing by degrees, some months before all sight was abolished, things, which I looked upon, seemed to swim to the right and left. Certain inveterate vapours seem to possess my forehead and temples, which, after meat especially, quite to evening generally urge and depress my eyes with a sleepy heaviness. Nor would I omit, that whilst there was as yet some remainder of sight, I no sooner lay down in my bed, and turned on my side, but a copious light dazzled out of my shut eyes; and as my sight diminished, every day colours gradually more obscure flashed out with vehemence; but now that the lucid is in a manner wholly extinct, a direct blackness, or else spotted, and, as it were, woven with ash-colour, is used to pour itself in. Nevertheless the constant and settled darkness, that is before me, as well by night as by day, seems nearer to the whitish than the blackish; and the eye rolling itself a little, seems to admit I know not what little smallness of light as through a chink."

But what he thought of his blindness, and how he bore it, may be seen by his sonnet to his friend Cyriac Skinner, grandson of the lord chief justice Coke, by his daughter Bridget, married to William Skinner, Esq; son and heir of Sir Vincent Skinner, Knt.

Cyriac, this three years day, these eyes, tho' clear
To outward view of blemish or of spot,
Bereft of sight, their seeing have forgot;
Nor to their idle orbs doth day appear,
Or, sun, or moon, or star, throughout the year,
Or man or woman. Yet I argue not
Against Heaven's hand or will, nor bate one jot
Of heart or hope, but still bear up, and steer
Right onward. What supports me, dost thou ask?
The conscience, friend, t'have lost them overply'd

^a Philips, p. 33, 34.

^b Ibid. p. 47.

^c Life of Milton, p. 76, 77, 78.

In liberty's defence, my noble task,
Whereof all Europe rings from side to side.
This thought might lead me thro' this world's vain mask,
Content, tho' blind, had I no other guide.

In 1652 there had been published at the Hague in 4to, a book intitled, "*Regii sanguinis clamor adversus parricidas Anglicanos.*" In this book a great many scandalous imputations were cast upon Milton, who is treated with prodigious scurrility, and among other epithets is stiled, "*Tartareus furcifer, teterrimus carnifex, hominis monstrum, &c.*" and at the end is a satire in Iambic verse "*in impurissimum nebulonem Joannem Miltonum, parricidarum & parricidii advocatum.*" The book is dedicated to king Charles II. (whose picture is prefixed to it) by Adrian Ulac, the printer, who calls Milton, "*Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum, & generis humani dishonestamentum.*" The true author of the book was Peter du Moulin the younger, afterwards prebendary of Canterbury, as he owns himself in the edition of his "*Latin Poems,*"^a printed at Cambridge 1670 in 8vo; where he tells us, that he had sent his papers to Salmasius, who committed them to the care of Alexander Morus, a French minister, and this latter published them, with a dedication to king Charles II. written in the name of the printer. This Morus was son of a Scotsman, who was principal of the protestant college at Castres in France, and was a man of a very haughty disposition, his contempt of his colleagues making him odious and uneasy wherever he lived; and he was generally thought to be a person of an immoderate inclination for women. He was extolled as an admirable preacher; but his chief talent must have consisted in the gracefulness of his pronunciation and gesture, and in those quaint turns, allusions, and puns, of which his sermons were full; for it is certain, that they do not now retain those charms in print, which they were said to have had formerly in the pulpit. He being suspected to be the author of the book abovementioned, Milton by public command published a second defence of the people of England at London, 1654, in 8vo, under this title: "*Joannis Miltoni Angli pro populo Anglicano Defensio secunda. Contra infamem libellum anonymum, cui titulus, Regii Sanguinis clamor ad coelum adversus Parricidas Anglicanos.*" In this book he considers Morus as the author of the "*Regii Sanguinis clamor,*" and accuses him of having behav'd in a very profligate and debauched manner at Geneva and other places, and inserts a distich made upon the report of his having gotten Salmasius's maid with child, which had been before printed in the news-papers at London^b, and which is as follows:

Galli ex concubitu gravidam te, Pontia, Mori,
Quis benè moratam morigeramque neget?

And Morus having threatned him with a second edition of "*Salmasius's Defence of the King,*" enlarged with animadversions on his "*Defence of the people,*" he introduces the following epigram:

Gaudete, Scombri, & quicquid est piscium Salo,
Qui frigidâ Hyeme incolitis argentes freta,
Vestrum misertus ille Salmasius eques.
Bonus amicire nuditatem cogitat,
Chartæque largus apparat papyrinos.
Vobis cueullos præferentes Claudii
Insignia, nomenque, & decus Salmasii;
Gestetis ut per omne cetarium forum
Equitis Clientes, scriniis mungentium
Cubito virorum, & capsulis gratissimos.

^a L. III. p. 141, 142.

^b Colomies, Bibliotheque Choise, p. 197.

In this book he pays a particular compliment to Cromwell, who had been installed protector on the 16th of December, 1653, and to whom he sent a present of it, immediately after the publication in May 1654, with a letter, which were both delivered to the Protector by Mr. Andrew Marvell, then residing at Eton, in the house of Mr. Oxenbridge, fellow of the college there, as tutor to Mr. Dutton, a young gentleman, for whom the protector had a particular concern. Mr. Marvell's letter to Milton, after the delivery of his book and letter, having never been published, deserves a place here.^a

HONOURED SIR,

"I Did not satisfy myself in the account I gave you of presenting your book to my lord, although it seemed to me, that I wrote to you all, which the messenger's speedy return the same night from Eton would permit me. And I perceive, that by reason of that haste, I did not give you satisfaction neither, concerning the delivery of your letter at the same time. Be pleased therefore to pardon me, and know, that I tendered them both together. But my lord read not the letter, while I was with him; which I attributed to our dispatch, and some other business tending thereto, which I therefore wished ill to, so far as it hindered an affair much better, and of greater importance, I mean that of reading your letter. And to tell you truly mine own imagination, I thought that he would not open it, while I was there, because he might suspect, that I delivering it just upon my departure, might have brought in it some second proposition, like to that, which you had before made to him by your letter to my advantage. However, I assure myself, that he has since read it, and you, that he did then witness all respect to your person, and as much satisfaction concerning your work, as could be expected from so cursory a review, and so sudden an account, as he could then have of it from me.

Mr. Oxenbridge, at his return from London, will, I know, give you thanks for his book, as I do with all acknowledgment and humility, for that you have sent me. I shall now study it even to the getting it by heart, esteeming it, according to my poor judgment (which yet I wish it were so right in all things else) as the most compendious scale, for so much, to the height of the Roman eloquence. When I consider how equally it turns, and rises with so many figures, it seems to me a Trajan's column, in whose winding ascent we see embossed the several monuments of your learned victories; and Salmasius and Morus make up as great a triumph, as that of Decebalus, whom too, for ought I know, you shall have forced, as Trajan the other, to make themselves away out of a just desperation.

I have an affectionate curiosity to know what becomes of colonel Overton's business, and am exceeding glad to think that Mr. Skinner is got near you; the happiness, which I at the same time congratulate to him, and envy, there being none who doth, if I may so say, more jealously honour you than,

HONOURED SIR,

Eton, June 2.

1654.

Your most affectionate humble servant,

ANDREW MARVELL.

For my most honoured friend, John Milton, Esq; secretary for the foreign affairs, at his house in Petty France, Westminster.

^a From a copy transcribed from the original by the reverend Mr. Owen of Rochdale, in Lancashire.

^b That colonel, who was governor of Hull, Mr. Marvell's native town, had been sent for from thence by the protector, and kept in London, upon pretence of Business; but the colonel knew not what. Letter of June, 1654. among Thurloe's State papers, Vol. II. p. 414.

The "Defensio Secunda" was reprinted at the Hague, by Adrian Ulac, and Morus soon after published an Answer to it; intitled, "Alexandri Mori, ecclesiastæ & sacrarum literarum professoris, fides publica, contra calumnias Joannis Miltoni:" Hague 1654, in 12mo; in which he inserted a great many testimonies of his orthodoxy and morals, signed by the consistories, academies, synods, and magistrates of the places where he had lived. This occasioned Milton to reply in his "Defensio pro se contra Alexandrum Morum ecclesiastem, libelli famosi, cui titulus, regii sanguinis clamor, &c. Authorem rectè dictum. London 1655, in 8vo." Peter du Moulin in the passage above quoted, tells us, that Morus being uneasy at the severe attack upon his character by Milton in his "Defensio secunda, begun to grow cool in the royal cause; and in his answer appealed to two gentlemen of great credit with the parliament-party, who knew the real author of the "Regii Sanguinis Clamor." This exposed du Moulin to great danger, he being then in England; but he informs us, that Milton being unwilling to own himself guilty of a mistake in his charge upon Morus, persisted in his accusation; so that the parliament-party let the true author escape with impunity, lest they should publicly contradict the patron of their cause. "At Morus, tantæ invidiæ impar, in regiâ causâ frigere cœpit, & clamoris Authorem Miltono indicavit. Enimvero in suâ ad Miltoni maledicta responsione, duos adhibuit testes præcipuæ apud perduelles fidei, qui authorem probè nossent, & rogati possent revelare. Unde sanè mihi & capiti meo certissimum impendebat exitium. At magnus ille justitiæ vindex, cui & hanc operam & hoc caput libens devoveram, per Miltoni superbiam salutem meam asseruit, ut ejus sapientiæ solenne est ex malis bona, ex tenebris lucem elicere. Miltonus enim, qui plenis caninæ eloquentiæ velis in Morum invehctus fuerat, quique id fermè unicum Defensionis secundæ suæ fecerat argumentum, ut Mori vitam atque famam laceraret, adduci nunquam potuit, ut se tam crassè hallucinatum esse fateretur. Scilicet metuens ne cœcitati ejus populus illuderet, eumque compararent grammaticorum pueri Catulo illi cœco apud Juvenalem, qui piscem Domitiano donatum laudaturus,

plurima dixit
In lævum conversus, at illi dextra jacebat
Bellua.

Perseverante igitur Miltono totum illud periculosi in Regem amoris crimen Moro impingere, non poterant cæteri perduelles sine magnâ boni patroni sui injuriâ alium à Moro tanti criminis reum peragere. Cumque Miltonus me saluum esse mallet quam se ridiculum, hoc operæ meæ præmium tuli, ut Miltonum, quem inclementius acceperam, haberem patronum, & capitis mei sedulum ὑπερασπιστήν."

Milton being now at ease from state-adversaries and public contests, had leisure again to prosecute his own studies, and private designs; particularly his "History of Britain," and his new "Thesaurus Linguae Latinæ," according to the method of Robert Stephens; "a work, says Mr. Philips," he had been long since collecting from his own reading, and still went on with at times even very near to his dying day. But the papers after his death were so discomposed and deficient, that they could not be made fit for the press." These papers consisting of three large volumes in folio, and containing a collection out of all the best and purest Roman authors, were made use of by the editors of the Cambridge dictionary printed in 1693 in 4to, with the title of "Linguae Romanæ Dictionarium luculentum novum." But the grand design, to which he now began to apply himself, was his Paradise Lost; the loss of his sight not the least diverting him from his studies; for, he observed in a letter to the learned Emeric Bigot, dated March 24, 1656, in which he thanked him for the honour of a visit, when that gentleman was in England, and of a letter since his return to France; that he bore his blind-

^a P. 34. ^b See the Preface, p. 4. of Mr. Robert Ainsworth's Thesaurus Linguae Latinæ. Compendiarius, Edit. London 1736, in 4to. ^c Philips, p. 34.

ness with the greater patience, as he was in hopes, that this misfortune would add new vigour to his genius; and that he was far from being averse to his studies, which had occasioned his loss of sight, being animated by the example of Telephus king of the Mysians, who readily consented to be healed by the weapon, from which he had received his wound. "Orbitatem certè luminis quidni lenitè feram, quod non tam amissum quam revocatum intus atque retractum, ad acuendam potius mentis Aciem quam ad hebetandam spem? Quo fit, ut neque Literis irascar, nec earum studia penitus intermittam, etiamsi me tam malè multaverint; tam enim morosus ne sim, Myforum regis Telephi saltem exemplum erudit, qui eo telo, quo vulneratus fuit, sanari postea non recusavit."

The protector Oliver Cromwell having, in 1655, resolved upon a war with Spain, his manifesto of the reasons inducing him to it was published in Latin, under this title "Scriptum Dom. Protectoris Reipublicæ Angliæ, Scotiæ, Hiberniæ, &c. ex consensu atque sententiâ concilii sui editum; in quo hujus Reipublicæ causa contra Hispanos justa esse demonstratur. Londini excudebant Henricus Hills & Johannes Field, Impressores Dom. Protectoris, 1655." And it is not to be doubted, both from the peculiar elegance of the style, and the duty of Milton's office, that this piece was the product of his pen. Nor is it improbable for the same reason, that the famous Latin verses, sent with the protector's picture to Christina queen of Sweden, were composed by our author, though ascribed by others to Andrew Marvel. His state-letters, written while he executed the post of Latin secretary, are an illustrious proof of his mastery of that language, upon the most difficult subjects, and have been the best model to his successors in that place.

The value, which he had for the writings of Sir Walter Raleigh engaged him in 1658, to publish at London in 8vo, a manuscript of that great man under the title of "The Cabinet-Council, containing the chief arts of empire, and mysteries of state; disabinated in political and polemical Aphorisms, grounded on authority and experience, and illustrated with the choicest examples and historical observations. By the ever renowned knight Sir Walter Raleigh. Published by John Milton, Esq;" with the following advertisement: "Having had the manuscript of this treatise, written by Sir Walter Raleigh, many years in my hands, and finding it lately by chance among other books and papers; upon reading thereof, I thought it a kinde of injury to withhold longer the work of so eminent an author from the publick, it being answerable in stile to other works of his already extant, as far as the subject would permit; and given me for a true copy by a learned man at his death, who had collected several such pieces."

The year following he appeared again as an author, in "a Treatise of the civil power in ecclesiastical causes;" printed at London, in 12mo; and another Tract intitled, "Considerations touching the likeliest means to remove hirelings out of the church. Wherein is also discoursed, of tithes, church-fees, church-revenues; and whether any maintenance of ministers can be settled by law. The author J. M. London 1659, in 12mo." The former piece restored him to the good opinion of some of his republican friends, who had before questioned his attachment to their principles; and Mr. Wall of Causton, in a letter,* dated May 26, 1659, after returning him thanks for the honour of his letters; adds, "I confess, I have (even in my privacy in the country) oft had thoughts of you, and that with much respect, for your friendship to truth in your early years, and in bad times. But I was uncertain, whether your relation to the court (though I think a commonwealth was more friendly to you than a court) had not clouded your former light: but your last book resolved that doubt. You complain of the non proficiency of the nation, and its retrograde motion of late, in liberty and spiritual truths. It is much to be bewailed, but still let us pity human frailty. When those, who made deep protestations of their zeal for our liberty both spiritual and civil, and made the fairest

* Transcribed from the original by the Reverend Mr. Owen, of Rochdale in Lancashire.

offers to be assertors thereof, and whom we thereupon trusted, when those being inflated in power, shall betray the good thing committed to them, and lead us back to Egypt; and by that force, which we gave them to win us liberty, hold us fast in chains, what can poor people do! You know who they were that watched our Saviour's sepulchre, to keep him from rising." Mr. Wall then urges him to proceed to that other subject, which he had promised, that hire greatly impedes Truth and Liberty; and which Milton soon after executed in his "Considerations."

The confusions of this year 1659, in which Richard Cromwell was obliged to resign the protectorship in May, and the parliament dissolved by the army in October, gave occasion to Milton to write a letter, in which he lays down the model of a commonwealth; not such as he thought the best, but what might be readiest settled at that time, to prevent the restoration of kingly government and domestic disorders, till a more favourable season, or better dispositions for erecting a perfect democracy. This and another small piece to the same purpose, which seems to be addressed to General Monk, were communicated to Mr. Toland by a gentleman, who, a little after Milton's death, had them from his nephew; and Mr. Toland gave them to be publish'd in the edition of our author's works in 1698, in fol. ^a

His "ready and easy way to establish a free commonwealth; and the excellence thereof compared with the inconveniences and dangers of re-admitting kingship in the nation," was published at London in Feb. 1659-60, in 4to. and soon after attacked in a burlesque pamphlet pretended to be written by Mr. James Harrington's Republican club, and printed under the title of "The Censure of the Rota upon Mr. Milton's book, entituled, The ready and easy way to establish a free commonwealth. London printed by Paul Giddy, printer to the Rota, at the sign of the Windmill in Turn-againe-Lane, 1660." Pagg. 16. In the title-page is the following order.

"Die Lunæ 26, Martii, 1660.

Ordered by the Rota, that Mr. Harrington be desired to draw up a narrative of this day's proceeding upon Mr. Milton's book, called, 'The ready and easy Way, &c. and to cause the same to be forthwith printed and published, and a Copy thereof to be sent to Mr. Milton.

Trundle Wheeler, Clerk to the Rota."

But a more serious answer was returned to it in a piece published in May 1660, intitled, "The dignity of kingship asserted; in answer to Mr. Milton's ready and easy way, &c. Proving that kingship is both in itself, and in reference to these nations, far the most excellent government, and the returning to our former loyalty or obedience thereto, is the only way under God, to restore and settle these three once flourishing, now languishing, broken, and almost ruined nations. By G. G. a lover of loyalty: humbly dedicated and presented to his most excellent majesty Charles II. of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, true hereditary king."

The near approach of the restoration did not deter our author from declaring his sentiments against monarchical government; for upon the publication of a sermon, intitled, "The fear of God and the King; preached by Matthew Griffith, D. D. at Mercer's-chapel, on Sunday, March 25, 1660," he immediately published "Brief Notes" upon it; which were remarked upon by Mr. Roger L'estrage, in a piece intitled, "No blind Guides," printed in his Apology at London, 1660 in 4to.

He held his office of Latin secretary, till within a short time of the restoration, when he was obliged to leave his house in Petty-France, where for eight years before he had been visited by all foreigners of note and several persons of quality; and by the advice

^a Toland, p. 37.

^b Wood, Col. 266. and Bishop Kennet's Register and Chronicle, p. 73.

of his friends absconded, till such time as the event of public affairs should direct him what course to take. For this purpose he retired to a friend's house in Bartholomew-Close near West-Smithfield, till the act of oblivion came forth; "which says Mr. Phillips, proved as favourable to him as could be hoped or expected, through the intercession of some, that stood his friends both in council and parliament: particularly in the house of commons, Mr. Andrew Marvel, a member for Hull, acted vigorously in his behalf, and made a considerable party for him; so that, together with John Goodwin of Coleman-street, he was only so far excepted, as not to bear any office in the commonwealth." But we have the most accurate account of this affair in Mr. Richardson's life of our author^b, whose words we shall transcribe. "That Milton escaped, is well known, but not how. By the account we have, it was by the act of indemnity; only incapacitated for any public employment. This is a notorious mistake, though Toland, the bishop of Sarum, Fenton, &c. have gone into it, confounding him with Goodwin. Their cases were very different, as I found upon enquiry. Not to take a matter of this importance upon trust, I had first recourse to the act itself. Milton is not among the excepted. If he was so conditionally pardoned, it must then be by a particular instrument. That could not be after he had been purified intirely by the general indemnity; nor was it likely the king, who had declared from Breda, he would pardon all but whom the parliament should judge unworthy of it, and had thus lodged the matter with them, should, before they come to a determination, bestow a private act of indulgence, and to one so notorious as Milton. 'Tis true, Rapin says, several principal republicans applied for mercy, whilst the act was yet depending, but quotes no authority; and upon search, no such pardon appears on record, though many are two or three years after, but then they are without restrictions. Some people were willing to have a particular as well as the general pardon. But whatever was the case of others, there is a reason besides what has been already noted, to believe no such favour would now be shewn to Milton. The house of commons (16th June 1660) vote the king be moved to call in Milton's two books, and that of John Goodwin, written in justification of the murder of the king, in order to be burnt; and that the Attorney-general do proceed against them by indictment or otherwise. June 27th, an order of council reciting that vote of the 16th, and that the persons were not to be found, directs a proclamation for calling in Milton's two books, which are here explained to be that against Salmasius (the Defence) and his Answer to Eikon Basilike; as also Goodwin's book. And a proclamation was issued accordingly, and another to the same purpose 13th of August. As for Goodwin, he narrowly escaped with life, but he was voted to be excepted out of the act of indemnity among the twenty designed to have penalties inflicted short of death. And August the 27th, those books of Milton and Goodwin were burnt by the hangman. The act of oblivion was passed the 29th, [Kennet's Register.] 'Tis seen by this account, that Milton's person and Goodwin's are separated, though their books are blended together. As the king's intention appeared to be to pardon all but actual regicides, as bishop Burnet says^c; it is odd he should say in the same breath, almost all people were surprized that Goodwin and Milton escaped all censure, (neither is that true, as has been seen.) Why should it be so strange, they being not concerned in the king's blood? That he was forgot, as Toland says some people imagined, was very unlikely. However it is certain, by what has been shewn from bishop Kennet, he was not. That he should be distinguished from Goodwin with advantage, will justly appear strange, for his vast merit as an honest man, a great scholar, and a most excellent writer, and his fame on that account, will hardly be thought the causes, especially when it is remembered "Paradise Lost" was not yet produced, and the writings, on which his vast reputation stood, were now accounted criminal, every one of them; and those most, which

^a P. 37.^b P. 86, &c. seq.^c History of his own Time, Vol. I. p. 163.

were the main pillars of his fame. Goodwin was an inconsiderable offender compared with him. Some secret cause must be recurred to in accounting for this indulgence. I have heard that secretary Morrice and Sir Thomas Clarges were his friends, and managed matters artfully in his favour. Doubtless they or somebody else did, and they very probably, as being very powerful friends at that time. But still how came they to put their interest on such a stretch in favour of a man so notoriously obnoxious? Perplexed and inquisitive as I was, I at length found the secret. It was Sir William Davenant obtained his remission in return for his own life procured by Milton's interest, when himself was under condemnation, Anno 1650. A life was owing to Milton, (Davenant's) and it was nobly paid: Milton's for Davenant's at Davenant's intercession. The management of the affair in the house of commons, whether by signifying the king's desire, or otherwise, was perhaps by those gentlemen named." This account Mr. Richardson had from Mr. Pope, who was informed of it by Mr. Thomas Betterton, the celebrated actor, who was first brought upon the stage by Sir William Davenant.

Milton was in custody of the serjeant at arms of the house of commons in December following, as he appears to have been from the following minutes in the books of that house, for a copy of which I am obliged to Mr. Richardson.

" Saturday, 15th Dec. 1660.

Ordered, That Mr. Milton, now in custody of the serjeant at arms attending this house, be forthwith released, paying his fees.

Monday, 17th Dec.

A complaint made, that the serjeant at arms had demanded excessive fees for the imprisonment of Mr. Milton.

Ordered, That it be referred to the committee for privileges to examine this business, and to call Mr. Milton and the serjeant before them, and to determine what is fit to be given the serjeant for his fees in this case."

But we have no account, when he was taken into custody. Guy Patin indeed in a letter dated July 13th, 1660^a writes, that he had just been told by M. de la Mothe le Vayer, that "Milton's book against the late king of England was burnt by the hands of the common hangman; that Milton was in custody; that he would probably be hanged; that Milton wrote that book only in English, and that a person, named, Peter du Moulin, son of Peter du Moulin of Sedan, who had translated it into elegant Latin, was in danger of his life." There is one very gross mistake here, since du Moulin was a zealous royalist, and author of *Regii Sanguinis clamor ad Cœlum*, as I have observed above. However M. Demissy, in a letter of his printed in the *Bibliothèque Britannique*, Tom. ix. Part 2. Art. 1. p. 234, observes, that this letter of Patin may serve to give us some light into the time, when Milton was taken into custody: that as this letter is dated July 13th, and mentions the news as just then received, it is possible, that it might reach Paris from London in four or five days, being dated the eighth or ninth of July, N. S. and the twenty-eighth or twenty-ninth of June, O. S. and that Milton might have been taken on one of those days. The order of council, which shews that he was not to be found, is dated the twenty-seventh, and would not stop the search after him. "I own, says Monsieur Demissy, that Patin adds another piece of news, which was not exactly true, viz. "that Milton's book against the late king of England" had been "burnt by the hands of the common hangman." Milton's book, or rather books, were not burnt till Aug. 27th. But one may easily conceive how such a piece of news, which was at the bottom true, might be anticipated on account of the order of council for

^a Letters choisies de feu Mr. Guy Patin, Vol. II. Lettr. 187. Edit. de Cologne 1691.

burning the condemned books; but it cannot be so easily conceived in my opinion, that a correspondent in England, who appears to have known of this order, in which Milton is said not to be found, should positively say, 'Milton is in Custody', unless he was seized after the publication of the order."

But after all, it is evident, that he was not in custody on the 13th of August, when the proclamation issued that day speaks of him, as fled or absconded; nor on the 12th of September, on which day a list of the prisoners in the custody of the serjeant at arms was read in the house of commons, and Milton's name not among them; and in the day following the house adjourned to the 6th of November. It is most probable therefore, that after the act of indemnity was past, and the house adjourned, he came out of his concealment, and was afterwards taken into custody of the serjeant of arms, by virtue of the former order of the house of commons; but we cannot find, that he was prosecuted by the attorney general, nor was he continued in custody very long, being set at liberty on the 12th of December.

Being secured by his pardon, he appeared again in public, and took a house in Holborn, near Red-lion-fields, but soon removed to Jewen-street, near Aldersgate-street, where he married his third wife, Elizabeth, the daughter of Mr. Minshul of Cheshire, recommended to him by his friend Dr. Paget of Coleman-street, to whom she was related; but he had no child by her^a. She died at Nantwich in Cheshire between twenty and thirty years ago.

Soon after the restoration he is said to have been offered the place of Latin secretary to the king, which he refused. Mr. Richardson, who relates this story, expresses himself in these terms: "My authority is Henry Bendish Esq; a descendant by his mother's side from the protector Oliver Cromwell. Their family and Milton's were in great intimacy before and after his death; and the thing was known among them. Mr. Bendish has heard the widow or daughter (of Milton) or both say it, that soon after the restoration, the king offered to employ this pardon'd man, as Latin secretary; the post in which he served Cromwell with so much integrity and ability. (That a like offer was made to Thurloe, is not disputed, as ever I heard. (Milton withstood the offer, the wife pressed his compliance. "Thou art in the right," says he; "you, as other women, would ride in your coach: for me, my aim is to live and die an honest man."

"The Accedence commenced Grammar," published by him at London, in 8vo. in 1661. is an instance of the condescension of one of the greatest geniuses that ever lived, equal to the highest subjects, stooping to one of the lowest, though the most useful, out of that zeal for the right education, which he shewed throughout his life. And the same year he gave the world another tract of Sir Walter Raleigh, intitled, "Aphorisms of State."

The year following 1662, we find him living in Jewen-street, in a private and retired manner, pursuing of his studies, by the assistance of a person employed in reading to him, who was usually the son of some gentleman of his acquaintance, and undertook that office, in order for improvement by his conversation and instructions. Mr. Thomas Ellwood, afterwards one of the most eminent writers amongst the quakers, and who gives us this account^c, attended him for these purposes, being recommended to him by Dr. Paget, and went every day in the Afternoon, except Sunday^d, and read to him such books in the Latin tongue as Milton thought proper^e. "At my first sitting to read to him," says Mr. Ellwood^f, observing that I used the English pronunciation, he told me, if I would have the benefit of the Latin tongue, not only to read and understand Latin authors, but to converse with foreigners either abroad or at home, I must learn the fo-

^a Philips, p. 38, 41.

^b Life of Milton, p. 100. written by his own hand, p. 154. 2d Edit. London 1714. in 8vo.

^f Ibid. p. 156.

^c History of the Life of Thomas Ellwood.

^d Ibid. p. 156.

^e Ibid. p. 154.

reign pronunciation. To this I consenting, he instructed me how to sound the vowels, so different from the common pronunciation used by the English, who speak Anglicè their Latin, that (with some few other variations in sounding some consonants in particular cases, as c before e and i like ch, sc before i like sh, &c.) The Latin thus spoken seemed as different from that which was delivered as the English generally speak it, as if it were another language. . . . This change of pronunciation proved a new difficulty to me. It was now harder to me to read, than it was before to understand when read. But

——Labor omnia vincit
Improbis ;

and so did I ; which made my reading the more acceptable to my master. He, on the other hand, perceiving with what earnest desire I pursued learning, gave me not only all the encouragement, but all the help he could. For having a curious ear, he understood by my tone, when I understood what I read, and when I did not ; and accordingly would stop me, examine me, and open the most difficult passages to me."

It was not long after Milton's third marriage, that he removed to an house in the Artillery-Walk leading to Bunhill-fields ; "and this," says Mr. Philips, "was his last stage in this world ; but it was of many years continuance ; more perhaps than he had had in any other place besides." And Mr. Richardson informs us^b, that "he used to sit in a grey coarse cloth coat at the door of this house, in warm sunny weather, to enjoy the fresh air ; and so, as well as in his room, received the visits of people of distinguished parts, as well as quality. And very lately I had the good fortune, continues Mr. Richardson, to have another picture of him from an ancient clergyman in Dorsetshire, Dr. Wright. He found him in a small house ; he thinks but one room on a floor. In that, up one pair of stairs, which was hung with a rusty green, he found John Milton sitting in an elbow-chair ; black clothes, and neat enough ; pale, but not cadaverous ; his hands and fingers gouty ; and with chalk-stones. Among other discourse he expressed himself to this purpose, that was he free from the pain this gave him, his blindness would be tolerable."

When the plague began to encrease in London, in 1665, Mr. Ellwood took a small house for Milton and his family, at St. Giles Chalfont, in Buckinghamshire ; and after the sickness was over, and the city well cleansed and become safely habitable again, Milton returned to London.

His "Paradise Lost was now finished, for when Mr. Ellwood visited him at St. Giles Chalfont, Milton lent him the manuscript of it, in order that he might read it over, and give him his judgment of it. When Mr. Ellwood returned it, Milton asked him how he liked it, and what he thought of it ; "which I modestly but freely told him, says Mr. Ellwood^c ; and after some further discourse about it, I pleasantly said to him, 'Thou hast said much of Paradise Lost ; but what hast thou to say of Paradise Found ?' He made me no answer, but sat some time in a muse ; then broke off that discourse, and fell upon another subject." When Mr. Ellwood afterwards waited upon him in London, Milton shewed him his "Paradise Regained, and in a pleasant tone said to him, "This is owing to you ; for you put it into my head by the question you put to me at Chalfont ; which before I had not thought of. Mr. Philips observes^c, that the subject of "Milton's Paradise Lost" was first designed for a tragedy ; "and in the fourth book of the poem," says he, "there are ten verses, which, several years before the poem was

^a P. 38.
^d Ibid.

^b Life of Milton, p. 4.
^e P. 35.

^c History of the Life of Tho. Ellwood, p. 246, 247.

begun, were shewn to me and some others, as designed for the very beginning of the said tragedy," The verses were these;

O thou! that, with surpassing glory crown'd,
Look'st from thy sole dominion like the God
Of this new world; at whose sight all the stars
Hide their diminish'd heads; to thee I call,
But with no friendly voice, and add thy name,
O Sun! to tell thee, how I hate thy beams,
That bring to my remembrance from what state
I fell; how glorious once above thy sphere;
'Till pride and worse ambition, threw me down,
Warring in Heav'n against Heav'n's matchless king.

There are several plans of "Paradise Lost" in the form of a tragedy in our author's own hand-writing in the manuscript in Trinity-college library, which contains likewise a great variety of other subjects for tragedies, and is as follows:

From MILTON's Manuscript.

The Persons.

Michael
Heavenly Love
Chorus of Angels
Lucifer
Adam } with the Serpent.
Eve }
Conscience
Death
Labour
Sicknesse
Discontent
Ignorance } Mutes.
with others
Faith
Hope
Charity.

The Persons.

Moses
Divine Justice, Mercie, Wisdom, heavenly
Love
Hesperus the Evening-star
Chorus of Angels
Lucifer
Adam
Eve
Conscience
Labour
Sicknesse
Discontent
Ignorance } Mutes
Feare
Death
Faith
Hope
Charity

Other Tragedies.

Adam in Banishment.
The Flood.
Abram in Egypt.

PARADISE LOST.

The Persons.

Moses *προλογίζει*, recounting how he assumed his true bodie; that it corrupts not, because of his [abode] with God in the mount; declares the like of Enoch and Eliah: besides the purity of the place, that certaine pure winds, dewes, and clouds preserve it from corruption; whence exhorts to the sight of God; tells they cannot see Adam in the state of innocence by reason of thire sin.

Justice
Mercie } debating what should become of Man, if he fall.
Wisdome }

Chorus of Angels sing a hymne of the creation.

Act II.

Heavenly Love
Evening-Starre
Chorus sing the marriage song, and describe paradise.

Act III.

Lucifer contriving Adam's ruine.
Chorus feares for Adam, and relates Lucifer's rebellion and fall.

Act IV.

Adam } fallen.
Eve }
Conscience cites them to God's examination.
Chorus bewailes, and tells the good Adam hath lost.

Act V.

Adam and Eve driven out of Paradise:
Præfented by an Angel with
Labour, Griefe, Hatred, Envie, Warre, Famine, Pestilence, Sicknesse, } Mutes.
Discontent, Ignorance, Feare, Death entered into the World;
To whome he gives thire names: likewise Winter, Heat, Tempest, &c.

Faith
Hope } comfort him, and instruct him.
Charity }
Chorus briefly concludes.

The Deluge.

Sodom.

“ Dinah. Vide Euseb. Præparat. Evang. L. 9. C. 22.

The Persons.

Dinah
Debora, Rebecca's nurse.
Jacob.
Simeon.
Levi.

Hamor.
Sichem.
Counselors 2.
Nuncius.
Chorus.

“ Thamar Cuophorusa ; where Juda is found to have bin the author of that crime, which he condemned in Thamar.

Thamar excused in what she attempted.

The golden Calfe, or the massacre in Horeb.

The Quails, Num. xi.

The Murmurers, Num. xiv.

Corah, Dathan, &c. Num. xvi. xvii.

Moabitides, Num. xxv.

Achan, Josue vii. and viii.

Josuah in Gibeon, Jos. x.

Gideon Idoloclastes, Jud. vi. 7.

Gideon pursuing, Jud. viii.

Abimelech the Usurper, Jud. ix.

Samson pursophorus, or Hybristes, or Dagonalia, Jud. xvi.

Samson marriing or in Ramath Lechi, Jud. xv.

Comazontes, or the Benjaminites, or the Rioters, Jud. xix. 20, 21.

Theristria, a pastoral out of Ruth.

Eliadæ, Hophni and Phineas, Sam. i. 2, 3, 4, beginning with the first overthrow of Israel by the Philistins, interlac't with Samuel's vision concerning Eli's familie.

Jonathan rescued, Sam. i. 14.

Doeg slandering, Sam. i. 22.

The sheepshearers in Carmel, a pastoral, 1 Sam. xxv.

Saul in Gilboa, 1 Sam. xxviii, 31.

David revolted, 1 Sam. from the xxviith ch. to the xxxist.

David adulterous, 2 Sam. xi. 12.

Thamar, 2 Sam. xiii.

Achitophel, 2 Sam. xv, 16, 17, 18.

Adoniah, 1 Reg. 2.

Solomon, Gynæocratumenos, or Idolomargus, aut Thyfiazusæ. Reg. i. 11.

Rehoboam, 1 Reg. 12. wher is disputed of a politick religion.

Abias Thersæus. 1 Reg. 14. The queen after much dispute, as the last refuge, sent to the profet Ahias of Shilo; receavs the message. The epitasis in that she, hearing the child shall die as she comes home, refuses to return, thinking thereby to elude the oracle. The former part is spent in bringing the sick prince forth, as it were desirous to shift his chamber and couch, as dying men use, his father telling him what sacrifice he had sent for his health to Bethel and Dan; his fearlessness of death, and putting his father mind to set to Ahiah. The chorus of the elders of Israel, bemoaning his vertues bereft them, and at another time wondring why Jeroboam being bad himself should so grieve for his son that was good, &c.

Imbres, or the Showers, 1 Reg. xviii. 19.

Naboth *συκοφαντάμενος*, 1 Reg. xxi.

Ahab, 1 Reg. xxii. beginning at the synod of fals profets; ending with relation of Ahab's death; his bodie brought; Zedeçiah slain by Ahab's friends for his seducing. (See Lavater, 2 Chron. xviii.)

Elias in the mount, 2 Reg. i. *Ὀρειβάτης*, or better, Elias Polemistes.

Elisæus Hudrochoos, 2 Reg. iii. Hudrophantes, Aquator.

Elisæus Adorodocétas.

Elisæus Minutes, five in Dothaimis, 2 Reg. 6.

Samaria Liberata, 2 Reg. vii.

Achabæi Cunoborwmeni, 2 Reg. 9. The scene Jesrael: beginning from the watchman's discovery of Jehu till he go out: in the mean while, message of things passing brought

brought to Jesebel, &c. Lastly the seventy heads of Ahab's sons brought of Ahaziah's, brethren slain on the way, ch. 10.

Jehu Belicola, 2 Reg. x.

Athaliah, 2 Reg. xi.

Amaziah Doryalotus. 2 Reg. xiv, 2 Chron. xxv.

Hezechias πολιορκούμενος, 2 Reg. xviii. 19. Hefechia besieged. The wicked hypocrisy of Shebna, spoken of in the xith or thereabout of Isaiah, and the commendation of Eliakim, will afford αφορμας λογε, together with a faction, that sought help from Egypt.

Josiah Αιαζόμενος 2 Reg. xxiii.

Zedechiah νεοτερίζων, 2 Reg. but the story is larger in Jeremiah.

Solomon Halosis; which may begin from a message brought to the city, of the judgment upon Zedechiah and his children in Ribla, and so seconded with the burning and destruction of city and temple by Nebuzaradan; lamented by Jeremiah.

Afa or Æthiopes, 2 Chron. xiv. with the deposing his mother, and burning her idol.

The three children, Dan. iii.

British Trag.

1. Venutius, husband to Cartismandua.
2. The cloister king Constans set up by Vortiger.
3. Vortiger marrying Roena. (See Speed.) Reproved by Vodin, archbishop of London. Speed.

The three following were added afterwards in the margin.

4. Vortiger poisoned by Roena.
5. Vortiger immured.
6. The massacre of the Britains by Hengist, in their cups at Salisbury-plain. Malmesbury.
7. Sigher of the East-Saxons revolted from the faith, and reclaimed by Jarumang.
8. Ethelbert of the East-angles slain by Offa the Mercian. See Holinsh. L. 6. C. 5. Speed in the life of Offa and Ethelbert.
9. Sebert slaine by Penda after he had left his kingdom. See Holinshed, 116 p.
10. Wulfer slaying his tow sons for beeing christians.
11. Osbert of Northumberland slain for ravishing the wife of Bernbocard, and the Danes brought in. See Stow. Holinsh. L. 6. c. 12. and especially Speed, L. 8. c. 2.
12. Edmund last king of the East-Angles martyred by Hinguar the Dane. See Speed, L. 8. c. 2.
13. Sigbert, tyrant of the West-Saxons slaine by a fwinheard.
14. Edmund brother of Athelstan slaine by a theefe at his owne table. Malmesb.
15. Edwin, son to Edward the younger, for lust deprived of his kingdom, or rather by faction of monks, whome he hated; together the impostor Dunstan.
16. Edward son of Edgar murdered by his step-mother. To which may be inserted the tragedie stirred up betwixt the monks and priests about marriage.
17. Etheldred, son of Edgar, a slothful king, the ruin of his land by the Danes.
18. Ceaulin, king of West-Saxons, for tyrannie deposed, and banished, and dying.
19. The slaughter of the monks of Bangor by Edelfride stirred up, as is said, by Ethelbert, and he by Austine the monk, because the Britains would not receive the rites of the Roman church. See Bede, Geoffrey Monmouth, and Holinshed, p. 104. which must begin with the convocation of British clergie by Austen to determin superfluous points, which by them were refused.

20. Edwin by vision promised the kingdom of Northumberland on promise of his conversion, and therein established by Rodoald king of East-Angles.

21. Oswin king of Deira slaine by Oswie his friend king of Bernitia, through instigation of flatterers. See Holinshed, p. 115.

22. Sigibert of the East-Angles keeping companie with a person excommunicated, slaine by the same man in his house, according as bishop Cedda had foretold.

23. Egfride king of the Northumbers slaine in battle against the Picts, having before wasted Ireland, and made warre for no reason on men that ever loved the English; forewarned also by Cuthbert not to fight with the Picts.

24. Kinewulf, king of West-Saxons, slaine by Kineard in the house of one of his concubins.

25. Gunthildis, the Danish Ladie, with her husband Palingus, and her son, slaine by appointment of the traitor Edrick in king Ethelred's days. Holinshed, 7 L. c. 5. together with the massacre of the Danes at Oxford. Speed.

26. Brightrick of West-Saxons poysoned by his wife Etheburge Offa's Daughter, who dies miserably also in beggary after adultery in a nunnery. Speed in Bithrick.

27. Alfred in disguise of a minstrel discovers the Danes negligence, sets on with a mightie slaughter; about the same tyme the Devonshire men rout Hubba and slay him.

A heroicall poem may be founded somewhere in Alfred's reigne, especially at his issuing out of Edelingsey on the Danes, whose actions are well like those of Ulysses.

28. Athelstan exposing his brother Edwin to the sea, and repenting.

29. Edgar slaying Ethelwold for false play in woing, wherein may be set out his pride, lust, which he thought to close, by favouring monks and building monasteries, also the disposition of women in Elfrida toward her husband.

30. Swane besieging London, and Ethelred repuls't by the Londoners.

31. Harold slaine in battle by William the Norman.

The first scene may begin with the ghost of Alfred, the second son of Ethelred, slaine in cruel manner by Godwin Harold's father, his mother and brother dissuading him.

32. Edmund Ironside defeating the Danes at Brentford, with his combat with Canute.

33. Edmund Ironside murdered by Edrick the traitor, and revenged by Canute.

34. Gunilda, daughter to king Canute and Emma, wife to Henry the third emperor, accused of inchaſtitie, is defended by her English page in combat against a giant-like adversary; who by him at two blows is slaine, &c. Speed in the life of Canute.

35. Hardiknute dying in his cups, an example to Riot.

36. Edward confessor's divorcing and imprisoning his noble wife Editha, Godwin's daughter; wherin is shewed his over-affection to strangers, the cause of Godwin's insurrection, wherin Godwin's forbearance of battel praised, and the English moderation on both sides magnified. His slacknesse to redresse the corrupt clergie, and superstitious prætence of chaſtitie.

• ABRAM from Morea, or ISACK redeemed.

The oiconomie may be thus. The fifth or sixth day after Abraham's departure, Eleazer, Abram's steward, first alone, and then with the chorus, discourse of Abraham's strange voyage, their mistresse sorrow and perplexity, accompanied with frightfull dreams; and tell the manner of his rising by night, taking his servants and his son with him. Next may come forth Sarah herself: after the chorus, or Ismael, or Agar; next some shepheard or companie of merchants passing through the mount in the time that Abram was

was in the midwork, relate to Sarah what they saw. Hence lamentations, fears, wonders; the matter in the mean while divulged. Aner or Eschcol, or Mamre, Abram's confederats come to the house of Abram to be more certaine, or to bring news; in the mean while discoursing as the world would, of such an action divers ways, bewayling the fate of so noble a man faln from his reputation; either through divine justice, or superstition, or coveting to doe some notable act through zeal. At length a servant sent from Abram relates the truth; and last he himselfe comes with a great traine of Melchizedec, whose shepheards beeing secrete eye-witnesses of all passages had related to thir master, and he conducted his freind Abraham home with joy.

B A P T I S T E S.

The Scene, the Court.

Beginning from the Morning of Herod's Birth-day.

Herod by some counseller perswaded^a on his birth day to release John Baptist, purposes it, causes him to be sent for to the court from prison. The queen hears of it, takes occasion to passe where he is, on purpose, that under prætence of reconciling to him, or seeking to draw a kind retraction from him of his censure on the marriage; to which end she sends a courtier before to sound whether he might be perswaded to mitigate his sentence, which not finding, she herselfe craftily assays, and on his constancie founds an accusation to Herod of a contumacious affront on such a day before many peers, præpares the king to some passion, and at last by her daughter's dancing effects it. There may prologize the spirit of Philip, Herod's brother. It may also be thought, that Herod had well bedewed himself with wine, which made him grant the easier to his wives daughter. Some of his disciples also, as to congratulate his liberty, may be brought in, with whom after certain command of his death many compassioning words of his disciples, bewayling his youth cut off in his glorious course, he telling them his work is done, and wishing them to follow Christ his maister.

S O D O M.

The Title Cupid's Funeral Pile. Sodom burning.

The Scene before Lot's Gate.

The chorus consists of Lot's shepherds come to the citty about some affairs, await in the evening thire master's return from his evening walk toward the city-gates. He brings with him two young men or youths of noble form. After likely discourses præpares for thire entertainment. By then supper is ended, the gallantry of the town passe by in procession with musick and song to the temple of Venus Urania or Peor, and understanding of tow noble strangers arrived, they send tow of thire choycest youth with the priest to invite them to their citty solemnities, it being an honour that thire citty had decreed to all fair personages, as beeing sacred to their goddesse. The angels being askt by the priest whence they are, say they are of Salem; the priest inveighs against the strict reign of Melchisedec. Lot, that knows their drift, answers thwartly at last, of which notice given to the whole assembly, they hasten thither, taxe him of præsumption, singularity, breach of citty-customs; in fine, after violence, the chorus of shepherds præpare resistance in thire maister's defence, calling the rest of the serviture; but being forced to give back, the angels open the dore, rescue Lot, discover themselves,

^a Or els the queen may plot under prætence of begging for his liberty, to seek to draw him into a snare by his freedom of speech.

warne him to gether his friends and sons in law out of the citty. He goes and returns as having met with some incredulous. Some other friend or son in law, out of the way when Lot came to his house, overtakes him to know his business. Here is disputed o incredulity of divine judgements, and such like matter; at last is described the parting from the citty; the chorus depart with their maister; the angels doe the deed with all dreadfull execution; the king and nobles of the citty may come forth, and serve to set out the terror; a chorus of angels concluding, and the Angels relating the event of Lot's journey and of his wife. The first chorus beginning, may relate the course of the citty, each evening every one with a mistress or Ganymed, gitterning along the streets, or solacing on the banks of Jordan, or down the stream. At the priest's inviting the angels to the solemnity, the angels pitying their beauty may dispute of love, and how it differs from lust, seeking to win them. In the last scene, to the king and nobles, when the first thunders begin aloft, the angel appears all girt with flames, which he saith are the flames of true love, and tells the king, who falls down with terror, his just suffering, as also Athane's, i. e. Gener, Lot's son in law, for despising the continual admonitions of Lot: then calling to the thunders, lightning, and fires, he bids them heare the call and command of God to come and destroy a godlesse nation: he brings them down with some short warning to other nations to take heed.

CHRISTUS PATIENS.

The scene in the garden beginning from the coming thither till Judas betraies, and the officers lead him away. The rest by message and chorus. His agony may receive noble expressions.

Christ born.

Herod massacring, or Rachel weeping, Matt. 2:

Christ bound.

Christ crucified.

Christ risen.

Lazarus. Joan. II.

ADAM UNPARADISED.

The Angel Gabriel either descending or entering, shewing since this globe was created, his frequency as much on earth, as in heaven: describes Paradise. Next the chorus shewing the reason of his coming to keep his watch in Paradise after Lucifer's rebellion, by command from God, and withall expressing his desire to see and know more concerning this excellent new creature, man. The angel Gabriel, as by his name signifying a prince of power, tracing paradise with a more free office, passes by the station of the chorus, and desired by them relates what he knew of man, as the creation of Eve, with their love and marriage. After this Lucifer appears after his overthrow, bemoans himself, seeks revenge on man. The chorus prepares resistance at his first approach. At last, after discourse of enmity on either side, he departs; whereat the chorus sings of the battell, and victorie in heaven against him and his accomplices; as before, after the first act, was sung a hymn of the creation. Heer again may appear Lucifer relating and insulting in what he had done to the destruction of man. Man next, and Eve having by this time been seduced by the serpent appears confusedly covered with leaves. Conscience in a shape accuses him, justice cites him to the place, where Jehova called for him. In the mean while the chorus entertains the stage, and is informed by some angel the manner of his fall. Heer the chorus bewailes Adam's fall. Adam then and Eve returne, accuse one another, but especially Adam layes the blame to his wife, is stubborn in his offence. Justice appears; reasons with him, convinces him. The chorus admo-

admonisheth Adam, and bids him beware Lucifer's example of impenitence. The angel is sent to banish them out of paradise; but before causes to passe before his eyes in shapen a mask of all the evils of this life and world. He is humbled, relents, despaires; at last appeares mercy, comforts him, promises the Messiah; then calls in faith, hope, and charity; instructs him; he repents, gives God the glory, submitts to his penalty. The chorus briefly concludes. Compare this with the former draught.

SCOTCH STORIES, or rather BRITISH of the North parts.

Athirco slain by Natholochus, whose daughter he had ravished, and this Natholochus usurping thereon the kingdom, seeks to slay the kindred of Athirco, who scape him and conspire against him. He sends to a witch to know the event. The witch tells the messenger, that he is the man shall slay Natholochus: he detests it, but in his journey home changes his mind, and performs it. Scotch Chron. English, p. 68, 69.

Duffe and Donwald, a strange story of witchcraft, and murder discovered and revenged. Scotch Story, 149, &c.

Haie, the plowman, who with his two sons, that were at plow running to the battell, that was between the Scots and Danes in the next field, staid the flight of his countrymen, renewed the battell, and caused the victorie, &c. Scotch Story, p. 155.

Kenneth, who having privily poisoned Malcolm Duffe, that his own son might succeed, is slain by Fenella. Scotch Hist. p. 157, 158, &c.

Macbeth, beginning at the arrivall of Malcolm at Mackduffe. The matter of Duncan may be expressed by the appearing of his ghost.

MOABITIDES OF PHINEAS.

The epitafis whereof may lie in the contention, first between the father of Zimri and Eleazer, whether he ought to have slain his son without law. Next, the embassadors of the Moabites expostulating about Cosbi a stranger and a noble woman slain by Phineas. It may be argued about reformation and punishment illegal, and, as it were, by tumult: after all arguments driven home, then the word of the Lord may be brought acquitting and approving Phineas.

Mr. Philips observes^a, that there was a very remarkable circumstance in the composition of Paradise Lost, "which I have a particular reason, says he, to remember; for whereas I had the perusal of it from the very beginning, for some years as I went from time to time to visit him, in a parcel of ten, twenty, or thirty verses at a time, (which being written by whatever hand came next, might possibly want correction as to the orthography and pointing,) having, as the summer came on, not been shewed any for a considerable while, and desiring the reason thereof, was answered, that his vein never happily flowed but from the autumnal equinox to the vernal; and that whatever he attempted at other times was never to his satisfaction, though he courted his fancy never so much; so that in all the years he was about this poem, he may be said to have spent but half his time therein." Mr. Toland imagines^b, that Mr. Philips was mistaken with regard to the time, since Milton in his Latin elegy, written in his twentieth year upon the approach of the spring, declares the contrary, and that his poetic talent returned with the Spring.

^a P. 36.

^b Life of Milton, p. 40.

Fallor ? an & nobis redeunt in Carmina vires,
 Ingeniumque mihi munere Veris adest ?
 Munere Veris adest, iterumque vigescit ab illo,
 (Quis putet ?) atque aliquod jam sibi poscit opus.

A friend of Milton's likewise informed Mr. Toland, that our author could never compose well but in the spring and autumn. But Mr. Richardson is of opinion ^a, that neither of these accounts is exactly true, nor "that a man with such a work in his head can suspend it for six months together, or but one, though it may go on more slowly; but it must go on. This laying it aside is contrary to that eagerness to finish what was begun, which he says [Epistle to Deodatus, dated Sept. 2. 1637] was his temper." The same gentleman informs us ^b, that when he dictated, he used "to sit leaning backward obliquely in an easy chair, with his leg flung over the elbow of it; that he frequently composed lying in bed in a morning; and that when he could not sleep, but lay awake whole nights, he tried; not one verse could he make: at other times flowed easy his unpremeditated verse, with a certain Impetus and Œstrum, as himself seemed to believe. Then, at what hour soever, he rung for his daughter to secure what came. I have been also told, he would dictate many, perhaps forty lines in a breath; and then reduce them to half the number. I would not omit," adds Mr. Richardson, "the least circumstance. These indeed are trifles; but even such contract a sort of greatness, when related to what is great."

After the work was ready for the press, it was near being suppressed by the ignorance or malice of the licenser, who, among other frivolous exceptions, imagined there was treason in that noble simile ^c, B. I. Vers. 594, and seqq.

—— as when the Sun new ris'n
 Looks thro' the horizontal misty air,
 Shorn of his beams; or from behind the Moon,
 In dim eclipse, disastrous twilight sheds
 On half the nations, and with fear of change
 Perplexes monarchs.

Mr. Philips ^d and Mr. Toland ^e assert, that this poem was published in 1666: but this is undoubtedly a mistake, since Milton's contract with his Bookseller Samuel Simmons for the copy bears date April 27th, 1667; in which contract our author sold his copy for no more than five pounds, but was to receive five pounds more after the sale of 1300 of the first impression, and five pounds more after the sale of as many of a second impression, and the number of each impression not to exceed 1500. This original contract is in the hands of Mr. Tonson the Bookseller; as is likewise the manuscript of the first book copied fair for the press, with the Imprimatur of Thomas Tomkyns, chaplain to archbishop Sheldon. Mr. Fenton ^f, as well as Mr. Wood, is mistaken in asserting, that it was first published in 1669; though it is true, there are of the first quarto editions with that year in the title-page. The case is thus; there are several titles, with a little variation in each, besides that of the date. There are of 1667 and 1668, as well as of 1669. The sheets are the same, only a word and a point or two altered; the sheet otherwise the same, not cancell'd, but the alteration made as it was printing; so that part of the impression was so far different from the other part. And there were not only three several title-pages, but a short advertisement to the reader, the argument to the several books, and a list of Errata are added, with a little discourse con-

^a P. 113.
 of Milton, p. 19, 20, 21.

^b P. 114.

^c Toland p. 40.

^d P. 38.

^e P. 40.

^f Life

cerning the kind of verse. But these additions were not exactly the same in every year, as neither were the names of the bookfellers, through whose hand it passed. The first title, viz. that of 1667, was immediately followed by the poem, without the advertisement, errata, &c. Two years almost elapsed, before 1300 copies could be sold, or before the author was intitled to his second five pounds, for which his receipt is still in being, dated April 26, 1669; and this was probably all that he received; for he did not live to enjoy the benefit of the second edition, which was published in 1674. under this title "Paradise Lost. A Poem in twelve books. The author John Milton. The second edition. Revised and augmented by the same author. London, in 8vo." In this edition he made some few alterations, chiefly additions; and now the poem, which at first consisted of ten Books, was divided into Twelve; "not, says Mr. Fenton, with respect to the Æneis (for he was, in both senses of the phrase, above imitation,) but more probably, because the length of the seventh and tenth required a pause in the narration, he divided them each into two." Upon this distribution, to the beginning of those books, which are now the eighth and twelfth, Milton added the following verses, which were necessary to make a connection:

Book VIII. Verse 1.

The angel ended, and in Adam's eare
So charming left his voice, that he a-while
Thought him still speaking; still stood fix'd to hear:
Then as new wak't, thus gratefully repli'd.

The latter half of the verse was taken from this in the first edition.

"To whom thus Adam gratefully reply'd."

Book XII. Verse 1.

As one, who on his journey bates at noon,
Though bent on speed; so here th'Arch-angel paus'd,
Betwixt the world destroy'd, and world restor'd:
If Adam aught perhaps might interpose:
Then, with transition sweet, new speech resumes.

At the same time he made some few additions in other places of the poem, which are as follow.

Book V. Verse 637.

"They eat, they drink, and with refection sweet
Are fill'd, before th'all-bounteous king, &c."

were thus enlarg'd in the second edition:

They eat, they drink, and in communion sweet
Quaff immortality and Joy, secure
Of surfeit, where full measure only bounds
Excess, before th'all-bounteous king, &c.

Book XI. Verse 484. after,

"Intestine stone, and ulcer, Colic-pangs,"

these three verses were added,

Dæmoniac phrenzie, moaping melancholie,
And moon-struck madnes, pining atrophie,
Marasmus, and wide-wasting pestilence.

And verse 551 of the same book (which was originally thus,

“Of rend’ring up. Michael to him reply’d”)

received this addition,

Of rend’ring up, and patiently attend
My Dissolution. Michael reply’d.

The third edition of this poem was published in 1678, in 8vo; and it appears that Milton had left his remaining right in the copy to his widow; who agreed with Simmonds the printer, to accept of eight pounds in full of demands; and her receipt for the money is dated Dec. 21. 1680. But a little before this Simmons had covenanted to assign the whole right of copy to Brabazon Aylmer the bookseller for twenty-five pounds; and Aylmer afterwards sold it to old Jacob Tonson at two different times, one half on the 17th of August, 1683, another on the 24th of March 1690, with a considerable advance of the price; and except one fourth of it, which has been assigned to several persons, his family have enjoyed the right of copy ever since. In 1688, another edition was published in Folio, with cuts, by subscription; and 1695, Mr. Tonson reprinted our author’s poetical works in Folio, with the same cuts, and large notes on *Paradise Lost* by P. H. who is said to be Philip Hume. This is the sixth edition. Since that it has been re-printed in several sizes. The thirteenth edition was published at London 1727, in 8vo, with “an account of Milton’s life by Mr. Elijah Fenton.” The fourteenth edition was printed in 1730.

But the most valuable is that of the learned and ingenious Thomas Newton, D. D. printed in two volumes in 4to, in 1749, and reprinted in 1750, in two volumes in 8vo. with the notes of various authors, as well as his own, particularly Mr. Hume, Mr. Addison, Dr. Bentley, Dr. Pearce, now lord bishop of Bangor, Mr. Richardson father and son, Mr. Warburton, Mr. Jortin, Mr. Upton, prebendary of Rochester, Dr. John Heylin, prebendary of Westminster, and Mr. Thyer, librarian of Manchester-college. An edition likewise of the first book was printed at Glasgow, in 4to, in 1750. from the standard one of 1672, with considerable notes, in which are illustrated the various allusions to the antient mythology so frequent in that book, and many passages of the antient poets remarked, which our poets has so thoroughly made his own.

It has been a current opinion, that the late lord Sommers first gave *Paradise Lost* a reputation; but Mr. Richardson observes^a, that it was known and esteemed long before there was such a man as lord Sommers, as appears from the pompous edition of it printed by subscription in 1688, where among the list of the subscribers are the names of lord Dorset, Waller, Dryden, Sir Robert Howard, Duke, Creech, Flatman, Dr. Aldrich, Mr. Atterbury, Sir Roger L’Estrange. Lord Sommers, who was likewise a subscriber, was then only John Sommers Esq; “No doubt,” says Mr. Richardson, “when he was so conspicuous himself as he afterwards was, his applause and encouragement spread and brightened its lustre; but it had beamed out long before.” However we find in the dedication of one of the editions of this poem to lord Sommers, that “it was his lordship’s opinion and encouragement, that occasioned the first appearing of this poem in the Folio edition, which from thence has been so well received, that notwithstanding the price of it was four times greater than before, the sale increased double the number every

^a P. 118.

year." Mr. Richardson tells us^a, that he was informed by Sir George Hungerford, an ancient member of parliament, that Sir John Denham came into the house of commons one morning with a sheet of "Paradise Lost", wet from the press, in his hand; and being asked what it was, said, that "it was part of the noblest poem, that ever was written in any language or in any age." However it is certain, that the book was unknown till about two years after, when the earl of Dorset produced it, as appears from the following story related to Mr. Richardson by Dr. Tancred Robinson, an eminent physician in London, who was informed by Sir Fleetwood Shepherd, that the earl, in company with that gentleman, looking over some books in Little-Britain, met with Paradise Lost, and being surprized with some passages in turning it over, bought it. The bookseller desired his lordship to speak in its favour, if he liked it, since the impression lay on his hands as waste paper. The earl having read the poem, sent it to Mr. Dryden, who in a short time returned it with this answer: "This man cuts us all out, and the ancients too."

The date of Dryden's epigram upon Milton does not appear; but the Latin verses of Dr. Samuel Barrow the physician, and the English ones by Mr. Andrew Marvell, were written before the second edition, and prefixed to it. Sir William Temple indeed in his "Essay on Poetry" takes not the least notice of Milton, and even expressly affirms; that after Ariosto, Tasso and Spenser, he knows none of the moderns, who have made any achievements in heroic poetry worth recording". And the duke of Buckingham in his "Essay on Poetry," prefers Tasso and Spenser to Milton.

After the reputation of "Paradise Lost" was universally established, Dr. Richard Bentley published in 1732, at London in 4to, a new edition of it; which raised and disappointed the expectation of the public. In the preface to it he tells us, that "the friend, or acquaintance, whoever he was, to whom Milton committed his copy and the overseeing of the press, did so vilely execute that trust, that Paradise under his ignorance and audaciousness may be said to be 'twice lost.' A poor bookseller, then living near Aldersgate, purchased our author's copy for ten pounds, and (if a second edition followed) for five pounds more, as appears by the original bond yet in being. This bookseller and that acquaintance, who seems to have been the sole corrector of the press, brought forth their first edition, polluted with such monstrous faults, as are beyond example in any other printed book. But these typographical errors, occasioned by the negligence of his acquaintance, (if all may be imputed to that, and not several wilfully made) were not the worst blemishes brought upon our poem. For this supposed friend (called in these notes the Editor) knowing Milton's bad circumstances; who,

Was fall'n on evil days and evil tongues,
In darkness, and with dangers compass'd round,
And solitude,

thought he had a fit opportunity to foist into his book several of his own verses without the blind poet's discovery." He afterwards observes, that "the proof-sheets of the first edition were never read to Milton; who, unless he was as deaf as blind, could not possibly let pass such gross and palpable faults. Nay, the edition, when published, was never read to him in several years. The first came out in 1667, and a second in 1674, in which all the faults of the former are continued with the addition of new ones." This edition of Dr. Bentley was attacked by several writers, particularly by Dr. Zachary Pearce, who in 1733, published at London in 8vo, "a Review of the text of the twelve books of Milton's Paradise Lost: in which the chief of Dr. Bentley's emendations are consider'd, and several other emendations and observations are offered to the public." In the

preface he observes, that "Dr. Bentley is deservedly distinguished for his superior talents in critical knowledge, which are owned by the unanimous consent of the learned world, and have gained him a reputation, which is real and substantial. But this will be understood with exception to what he has done on Milton's poem; in which, though he has given us some useful and judicious remarks, yet at the same time, he has made many emendations, which may justly be called in question." Dr. Pearce then tells us, that in 'the emendations, which he offers as from himself, he never ventures farther than to propose words of like sound, which a blind poet's ear may be presumed to have been sometimes mistaken in, when the proof-sheets were read to him; and but few of this sort are mentioned. The greatest part arises from the alteration of the points, in which it is not improbable, that Milton trusted much to the care of the printer and reviser.' He remarks next, that, he cannot agree with Dr. Bentley, that there was any such 'Person of an Editor,' as made alterations, and added verses at his pleasure in the first edition of this poem; because the account, which Mr. Toland gives us of Milton's life, will not leave us room to suspect, that he wanted one, or indeed many learned friends, to have done him justice on this occasion. Most probably several of his acquaintance, we are sure that some of them, had had the perusal of the poem before it was published; and would none of them have discovered it to Milton, if he had received such an injury? Would none have warned him of the bold alterations, time enough at least to have prevented their being continued in the second edition, published likewise in the poet's life-time? Besides the first edition of 'Paradise Regained' appeared in 1671; and Dr. Bentley says, that this edition is without faults, because Milton was then in high credit, and had changed his old printer and supervisor.' How far this changing his printer might contribute to make the first edition of this poem more correct than the first edition of "Paradise Lost," we cannot certainly say; but it may be asked of the doctor, why Milton's still higher credit in 1674, when the second edition of "Paradise Lost" appeared, could not have procured him the same supervisor, or one at least as good?" Dr. Pearce afterwards observes, that Milton took the first hint of his design of writing a tragedy upon the subject of his poem, from an Italian tragedy called "Il Paradiso perduto," still extant, and printed many years before he entered upon his design. Mr. Richardson^a likewise rejects the hypothesis of Dr. Bentley, and shews^b that "the edition of 1674 is the finished, the genuine, the uncorrupted work of Milton.

This poem has been translated in blank verse into Low-Dutch, and printed at Harlem 1728, in 4to. A French translation of it by M. Dupré de S. Maur, with Mr. Addison's Remarks, and a life of the author, was printed at Paris 1729, in three volumes 12mo; and reprinted at the Hague, 1730, in three volumes in 12mo; to which is added, "Dissertation critique de M. Constantin de Magny," which is thought by some to have been written by the Abbé Pellegrin, and "La Chûte de l'homme, Poème François par M. Durand." In this edition several passages are restored, which had been retrenched in that of Paris. Signor Paolo Rolli, F. R. S. published an Italian translation of this poem at London, 1736. in fol. In 1690, Mr. William Hog or Hogæus, a Scotsman, who afterwards died in very necessitous circumstances in the streets of London, published there by the encouragement of Dr. Daniel Coxe, an eminent physician, a translation of Paradise Lost, Paradise Regained, and Sampson Agonistes, in Latin verse. But this version is too paraphrastical, and very unequal to the original. A much more exact and spirited translation of the first book was published in 1691, at Cambridge in 4to, by Mr. Thomas Power, of Trinity college, in that University, who likewise translated the rest of that poem, partly before he went upon, and partly during his voyage to Bermudas, whence he sent the remainder of his translation to Dr. Bentley, in order to be printed for the benefit of his creditors. But it is still in manuscript. In 1699 there appeared in a pamphlet, intitled, "Lusus Amatorius, sive Musæi poema de Herone et Leandro,

^a P. 122, & seqq.^b P. 13^{oo}.

è Græcâ in Latinam linguam translatum. Cui aliæ (tres scilicet) accedunt Nugæ Poeticæ. Authore C. B." London in 4to. which contains a Latin translation of a fragment of the fifth book of "Paradise Lost," beginning verse 67, and ending ver. 245. Mr. Michael Bold of the same college published likewise in 1702, in 8vo. a Latin version of the first book; as Dr. Trap did of the whole poem, in 1741 in 4to. and Mr. William Dobson of New-College, Oxford, did of the first six books, printed at London, 1750, in the same form. And in 1736, Mr. Richard Dawes, M. A. and fellow of Emanuel College in Cambridge, published proposals for printing by subscription "Paradisi amissi a Cl. Miltoño conscripti liber primus Græcâ versione donatus, una cum annotationibus:" of which he gave the following specimen, beginning B. I. V. 250.

----- Ζήσοιτε τρισόλβιοι ἄγροϊ
 Χαρματοοίκητοι· φοβεραὶ δ' ἐπιχαίρετ' ἔρημοι.
 Κόσμος ὑποχθόνιος τε, σὺ δ' Ἀδης· εὐρυβάθυστος.
 Ἠγεμόν' ἐνδέξαιο νεήλυδα, τόν γε νόημα
 Οὐ πόπῳ ἔδδ' χρόνῳ μετακίνητον φορέοντα.
 Ἀυτοτόπος νόος ἐστὶ, καὶ αὐτοφύεσσ' ἀρετῇσιν
 Οὐρανὸν ἂν περίοιδε μεταλλάξαι τε καὶ Ἀδην.
 Αὐτότατος δ' ἄρ' ἐὼν τίπτ' ἂν μελετῶμι τόποιο,
 Τῷ μόνον οὐκ ἴσος τὸν ὑπερμεγάλυνε κεραυνός;
 Ἀλλ' ὧδε προέθηκευ ἐλευθερίας ἀπολαύσειν
 Ἀφθονας, ἀλλ' ἐνθενδ' ὕψιζυγος ἐπὶτ' ἀπείργει.
 Ὡδε μέν ἡσύχιοι βασιλεύσομεν· αὐταρ ἐγώ γε
 Ἐνδοξὸν καὶ Ἀδὴ διομαι ἐμβασιλεύειν.
 Μᾶλλον ἂν Ἀδοτύραννος ἢ Οὐρανόδελος ἐσοίμην.

This poem of our author has met with an approbation, which will continue as long as a true taste for poetry shall remain among mankind. I shall give the judgments of some writers upon it. Mr. Edward Philips^a, on account of this performance, styles Milton "the exactest of heroic poets, either of the ancients or moderns, either of our own or whatsoever nation else." However Mr. Thomas Rymer, who treated Shakspeare with so much contempt, presumed likewise to declare war against Milton, threatening "to write some reflections upon Paradise Lost, which some, says he^b, are pleased to call a poem; and to assert rhyme against the slender sophistry, wherewith he attacks it."

Mr. Dryden^c observes, that for our author, "whom we all admire with so much justice, his design is not that of an "Heroic Poem" properly so called. His design is the losing of our happiness; his event is not prosperous like that of other Epic works; his heavenly machines are many; and his human persons are but two. But I will not take Mr. Rymer's work out of his hands; he has promised the world a critique on that author, wherein, though he will not allow his poem for Heroic, I hope he will grant us, that his thoughts are elevated, his words sounding; and that no man has so happily copied the manner of Homer, or so copiously translated his Grecisms and the Latin elegancies of Virgil. 'Tis true, he runs into a flat thought sometimes for a hundred lines

^a Theatrum Poetarum among the modern poets, 114. Edit. London 1675.

^b Tragedies of the last age considered and examined by the practice of the ancients, and by the common sense of all ages. In a letter to Fleetwood Shephard, Esq; p. 143. Edit. London 1678.

p. 8, 9.

^c Preface to his translation of Juvenal,

together; but it is when he has got into a track of scripture. His antiquated word were his choice, not his necessity; for therein he imitated Spenser, as Spenser did Chaucer. And though perhaps the love of their masters may have transported both too far in the frequent use of them; yet, in my opinion, obsolete words may then be laudably revived, when either they are more sounding or more significant than those in practice, and when their obscurity is taken away by joining other words to them, which clear the sense, according to the rule of Horace for the admission of new words. But in both cases a moderation is to be observed in the use of them, for unnecessary coinage, as well as unnecessary revival, runs into affectation, a fault to be avoided on either hand. Neither will I justify Milton for his Blank Verse, though I may excuse him by the example of Hannibal Caro and other Italians, who have used it. For whatever causes he alleges for the abolishing of rhyme, his own particular reason is plainly this, that rhyme was not his talent; he had neither the ease of doing it, nor the graces of it; which is manifest in his *Juvenilia*, or verses written in his youth, where his rhyme is always constrained and forced, and comes hardly from him, at an age, when the soul is most pliant, and the passion of love makes almost every man a rhimer, though not a poet." He afterwards tells us^a, that he consulted Milton for "the beautiful turns of words and thoughts: But as he endeavours every where," says he, "to express Homer, whose age had not arrived to that fineness, I found in him a true sublimity, lofty thoughts, which were clothed with admirable Grecisms and antient words, which he had been digging from the mines of Chaucer and of Spenser, and which, with all their rusticity, had somewhat of venerable in them; but I found not there what I looked for, viz. any elegant turns, either on the word or on the thought." But the author of the *Tatler*^b is of a different opinion from Mr. Dryden in this last point, and having quoted that beautiful passage in *Paradise Lost*, B. IV. 639.

With thee conversing, &c.

he observes, that he could shew "several passages in Milton, that have as excellent turns of this nature as any of our English poets whatsoever.

Mr. Addison's criticism upon this poem published in the *Spectator*, has been of great advantage to its reputation; and, as Dr. Fiddes remarks^c, "has discovered a multitude of beauties in it, several of which might perhaps have been undiscovered for many ages.

Bishop Atterbury's high esteem of our author is evident from his letter to Mr. Pope, dated at Bromley, Nov. 8th, 1717, "I return you, says he, your Milton, which, upon collation, I find to be revised and augmented in several places, as the title-page of my third edition pretends it to be. When I see you next, I will shew you the several passages alter'd and added by the author, beside what you mentioned to me. I protest to you, this last perusal of him has given me such new degrees, I will not say of pleasure, but of admiration and astonishment, that I look upon the sublimity of Homer, and the majesty of Virgil with somewhat less reverence than I used to do. I challenge you, with all your partiality, to shew me in the first of these any thing equal to the allegory of Sin and Death, either as to the greatness and justness of the invention, or the height and beauty of the colouring. What I looked upon as a rant of Barrow's, I now begin to think a serious truth, and could almost venture to set my hand to it;

Hæc quicunque legit, tantum cecinisse putabit
Mæonidem Ranas, Virgilium Culices.

But more of this when we meet."

^a Ibid. p. 50
^b N^o 114.
^c Prefatory epistle concerning some remarks to be published on
Homer's *Iliad*, p. 13. Edit. London 1714.

Mr. Charles Gildon ^a observes, that Mr. Addison in his criticism upon Milton published in the Spectator, seems to have mistaken the matter in endeavouring to bring Paradise Lost to the rules of the epopœia, which cannot be done; and that Sir Richard Blackmore in his "Essay upon Epic Poetry," led by the same error, endeavours to defend Milton by his own rules of the epopœia. "But they are both mistaken, says Mr. Gildon; it is not an heroic poem, but a divine one, and indeed a new species. It is plain, that the proposition of all the heroic poems of the Ancients mentions some one person as the subject of their poem. Thus Homer begins his Ilias by proposing to sing the anger of Achilles; and his Odyssæy begins,

Muse, speak the man, who, since the siege of Troy,
So many towns, such change of manners saw.

And Virgil begins his Æneis with,

Arms and the man I sing, &c.

But Milton begins his poem of Things, and not of Men; as,

Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, &c."

M. de Voltaire ^b tells us, that Milton, as he was travelling through Italy in his youth, saw at Florence a comedy called Adamo, written by one Andreino, a player, and dedicated to Mary de Medicis, queen of France. The subject of the play was the "Fall of Man;" the actors, God, the devils, the angels, Adam, Eve, the serpent, death, and the seven mortal sins. That topic, so improper for a drama, but so suitable to the absurd genius of the Italian stage, as it was at that time, was handled in a manner intirely conformable to the extravagance of the design. The scene opens with a chorus of angels, and a cherubim thus speaks for the rest: "Let the rainbow be the fiddlestick of the fiddle of the heavens; let the planets be the notes of our music; let time beat carefully the measure, and the winds make the sharps, &c." Thus the play begins; and every scene rises above the last in profusion of impertinence. Milton, continues Voltaire, "pierced through the absurdity of that performance to the hidden majesty of the subject; which being altogether unfit for the stage, yet might be for the genius of Milton, and for his only, the foundation of an epic poem. He took from that ridiculous trifle the first hint of the noblest work, which human imagination hath ever attempted, and which he executed more than twenty years after. In the like manner Pythagoras owed the invention of music to the noise of the hammer of a blacksmith. And thus in our days Sir Isaac Newton walking in his gardens had the first thought of his system of gravitation, upon seeing an apple falling from a tree. If the difference of genius between nation and nation ever appeared in its full light, it is in "Milton's Paradise Lost." The French answer with a scornful smile, when they are told there is in England an epic Poem, the subject whereof is the Devil fighting against God, and Adam and Eve eating an apple at the persuasion of a snake. As that topic hath afforded nothing among them but some lively lampoons, for which that nation is so famous; they cannot imagine it possible to build an epic poem upon the subject of their ballads. And indeed such an error ought to be excused; for if we consider with what freedom the politest part of mankind throughout all Europe, both catholics and protestants, are wont to ridicule in conversation those consecrated histories; nay if those, who

^a Laws of poetry explain'd and illustrated, p. 259. Edit. London 1721. in 8vo.

^b Essay upon the Epic Poetry of the European nations from Homer down to Milton, p. 103, & seqq. Edit. London, 1727.

have the highest respect for the mysteries of the Christian religion, and who are struck with awe at some parts of it, yet cannot forbear now and then making free with the devil, the serpent, the frailty of our first parents, and the rib, which Adam was robbed of, and the like; it seems a very hard task for a profane poet to endeavour to remove those shadows of ridicule, to reconcile together what is divine and what looks absurd, and to command a respect, that the sacred writers could hardly obtain from our frivolous minds. What Milton so boldly undertook, he performed with a superior strength of judgment, and with an imagination productive of beauties not dreamed of before him. The meanness (if there is any) of some parts of the subject is lost in the immensity of the poetical invention. There is something above the reach of human forces to have attempted the creation without bombast, to have described the gluttony and curiosity of a woman without flatness, to have brought probability and reason amidst the hurry of imaginary things belonging to another world, and as far remote from the limits of our notions, as they are from our earth; in short, to force the reader to say, 'If God, if the Angels, if Satan would speak, I believe they would speak as they do in Milton.' I have often admired how barren the subject appears, and how fruitful it grows under his hands. The *Paradise Lost* is the only poem, wherein are to be found in a perfect degree that uniformity, which satisfies the mind, and that variety which pleases the imagination; all its episodes being necessary lines, which aim at the centre of a perfect circle. Where is the nation, who would not be pleased with the interview of Adam and the angel, with the mountain of vision, with the bold strokes, which make up the relentless, undaunted, and sly character of Satan? But above all, with that sublime wisdom, which Milton exerts, whenever he dares to describe God, and to make him speak? He seems indeed to draw the picture of the Almighty, as like as human nature can reach to, through the dust in which we are clouded. The Heathens always, the Jews often, and our Christian priests sometimes, represent God as a tyrant infinitely powerful. But the God of Milton is always a creator, a father, and a judge; nor is his vengeance jarring with his mercy, nor his predeterminations repugnant to the liberty of man. These are the pictures, which lift up indeed the soul of the reader. Milton in that point as well as in many others, is as far above the antient poets, as the Christian religion is above the heathen fables. But he hath especially an indisputable claim to the unanimous admiration of mankind, when he descends from those high flights to the natural description of human things. It is observable, that in all other Poems Love is represented as a vice; in Milton only it is a virtue. The pictures he draws of it are naked as the persons he speaks of, and as venerable. He removes with a chaste hand the veil, which covers every where else the enjoyments of that passion. There is softness, tenderness, and warmth without lasciviousness: the poet transports himself and us into that state of innocent happiness, in which Adam and Eve continued for a short time. He soars not above human, but above corrupt nature; and as there is no instance of such love, there is none of such nature." M. de Voltaire then proceeds to remark, that the French critics would not approve of Milton's excursions^a; he touches upon his errors, as contradictions, his "frequent glances at the Heathen mythology;" his "preposterous and awkward jests," his Puns, and too "familiar expressions"^b; and he objects to the contrivance of the Pandæmonium^c; the fiction of Death and Sin^d; the Bridge built by Death and Sin^e; the "Paradise of Fools"^f; and the war in Heaven^g.

The author of "*Lettres Critiques a Mr. le Comte *** sur le Paradis Perdu & Reconquis de Milton: Par R**.*" printed at Paris 1731, in 8vo, tells us^h, that "Milton is in his kind one of the greatest geniuses, which ever appeared in the world. His imagination, which is strong, elevated, extensive, lively, brilliant, fruitful, adorned

^a P. 110.^b P. 112, 113.^c P. 113, 114.^d P. 114, 115, 116.^e P. 117.^f Ibid.^g P. 117, 118, 119.^h P. 2.

with every thing, which the study of polite learning can add to excellent natural parts, gives him a superiority over all those, who have run the same course with him, which Virgil and Homer alone can dispute with him." But he declares, that "Paradise Lost" is very far from being so faultless a poem as Mr. Addison represents it; and he objects against the subject of it, which he observes to be "original Sin"; whereas the subject of an epic poem ought always to be an action virtuous, or at least innocent, and happy in the event of it^a. He concludes his criticism with remarking^b, that "the subject and fable of Milton's appear to be absolutely faulty: justness, method, probability, decorum, in short, every thing, which requires art and reflection, is extremely neglected in Milton: one would often be tempted to think, that these qualities essential to an epic poem were never known to him. Of seven or eight epic poets, which I have now in my hands, there is not one, but is superior to him in all these points. But these defects are happily effaced by the invention, the fruitfulness, force, and beauty of imagination, which shine throughout 'Paradise Lost'. This compensation has the same effect upon me as the fine passages in Homer, Archilochus, &c. had upon Longinus. I can readily say with that learned critic^c: "One of these beautiful strokes and sublime thoughts in the works of these excellent authors, is sufficient to atone for their defects."

Mr. Richardson observes, ^d that "Milton's Language is English, but 'tis Milton's English; 'tis Latin, 'tis Greek English. Not only the words, the phraseology, the transpositions, but the ancient idiom is seen in all he writes. . . . Poetry pretends to a language of its own: that of the Italian poetry is so remarkably peculiar, that a man may well understand a prose-writer, and not a poet. Words, tours of expression, the order of them, all has something not prosaic. This is observable particularly in Shakespeare. Milton has applied it to that sublimity of subject, in which he perpetually engages his reader above what Shakespeare ever aimed at, and where this is peculiarly necessary. Nor does he want abundant instances of what all good poets have: the sound of the words, their harshness, smoothness, or other properties, and the ranging and mixing them, all help to express, as well as their signification. . . . A reader of Milton must be always upon duty: he is surrounded with Sense; it rises in every line, every word is to the purpose. There are no lazy intervals: all has been considered, and demands and merits observation. Even in the best writers you sometimes find words and sentences, which hang on so loosely, you may blow them off. Milton's are all substance and weight: fewer would not have served the turn, and more would have been superfluous. His silence has the same effect, not only that he leaves work for the imagination, when he has entertained it, and furnished it with noble materials; but he expresses himself so concisely, employs words so sparingly, that whoever will possess his ideas, must dig for them, and oftentimes pretty far below the surface. If this is called obscurity, let it be remembered, 'tis such a one as is complaisant to the reader, not mistrusting his ability, care, diligence, or the candidness of his temper; not that vicious obscurity, which proceeds from a muddled inaccurate head, not accustomed to clear, well-separated, and regularly-ordered ideas, or from want of words and method and skill to convey them to another, from whence always arises uncertainty, ambiguity, and a sort of a moon-light prospect over a landscape, at best not beautiful. Whereas if a good writer is not understood, it is because his reader is unacquainted with or incapable of the subject, or will not submit to do the duty of a reader, which is to attend carefully to what he reads. What Macrobius says of Virgil, is applicable to Milton: "He keeps his eye fixed and intent upon Homer, and emulates alike his greatness and simplicity, his readiness of speech and silent majesty." By "silent majesty," he

^a P. 2, 3, 4, 5, 12.
& seqq.

^b P. 182, 183.

^c Longin. Traité du Sublime, Chap. 27.

^d P. 142,

seems to mean with Longinus, "his leaving more to the imagination than is expressed." Mr. Richardson then observes^a, that it is of no great importance, whether *Paradise Lost* be called an Heroic or a Divine Poem, or only, as the author himself has called it in his title-page, a Poem. "What if it were a composition intirely new, and not reducible under any known denomination? But it is properly and strictly heroic, and such Milton intended it, as he has intimated in his short discourse concerning the kind of verse, which is prefixed to it, as also in his entrance on the ninth book. And it is not his fault, if there have been those, who have not found a hero, or who he is. It is Adam; Adam, the first, the representative of human race. He is the hero in this poem, though, as in other heroic poems, superior beings are introduced. The business of it is to conduct man through variety of conditions of happiness and distress, all terminating in the utmost good; from a state of precarious innocence, through temptation, sin, repentance, and finally a secure recumbency upon, and interest in the supreme good by the mediation of his son. He is not such a hero as Achilles, Ulysses, Æneas, Orlando, Godfrey, &c. all romantic worthies, and incredible performers of fortunate savage cruelties. He is one of a nobler kind, such as Milton chose to write of, and found he had a genius for the purpose. He is not such a conqueror as subdued armies or nations, or enemies in single combat; but his conquest was what justly 'gave heroic name to person and to poem.' His hero was 'more than a conqueror through him, that loved us; as Rom. viii. 37.' This was declared to be the subject of the poem at the entrance on it, man's first disobedience and misery, till our restoration to a more happy state. The design of it is also declared; 'twas to justify providence; all which is done. The moral we are also directed to; and this the poet has put into the mouth of an angel. Many moral reflections are excited throughout the whole work; but the great one is marked strongly XII. 745, &c. PIETY AND VIRTUE, ALL COMPRIZED IN ONE WORD, CHARITY, IS THE ONLY WAY TO HAPPINESS. If the sublimity and peculiarity of the matter of this poem, if its superiority in that respect has raised it above some of the rules given by Aristotle, or whatever other critics, and gathered from or founded on the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, or *Æneid*; it has distinguished it to its greater glory. It is not only an heroic poem, but the most so that ever was wrote. Milton did not despise rules, such as were built upon reason, so far as those established reached; but as his free and exalted genius aspired beyond what had yet been attempted in the choice of his subject, himself was his own rule, when in heights, where none had gone before, and higher than which none can ever go. Milton's true character as a writer is, that he is an ancient, but born two thousand years after his time. His language indeed is modern, but the best, next to Greek and Latin, to convey those images himself conceived; and that moreover Greek'd and Latinized, and made as uncommon and expressive as our tongue could be, and yet intelligible to us for whom he wrote. But all his images are pure antique, so that we read Homer and Virgil in reading him; we read them in our own tongue, as we see what they conceived, when Milton speaks; yes, and we find ourselves amongst persons and things of a more exalted character. Connoisseurs in painting and sculpture can best tell what is the difference of taste in ancient and modern work; and can therefore best understand what I am now saying. It must suffice that I tell others, that there is a certain grace, majesty, and simplicity in that antique, which is its distinguishing character. The same kind of taste is seen in writing; and Milton has it, I think, to a degree beyond what we ever found in any modern painter or sculptor, not excepting *Rafaele* himself". Those who are unaccustomed to this train of thinking, may only please to dip into Chaucer, Spenser, Ariosto, even Tasso, or any of the moderns, and observe what Gothic figures and things present themselves to their imagination, or what are comparatively mean. Let them read even

the ancients, the best of them (always excepting the most ancient of all, the Pentateuch, Job, and some other of the sacred books;) and they will find even these fill not, nor enrich the mind, as Milton does. His Eden, his chaos, hell, heaven, his human figures, his angels good and evil, his mediator, his God, all is superior to what is elsewhere to be found, all are with regard to the rest like what *Rafaelle's* pictures exhibit, compared with what we see in those of any other master; or (to speak more familiarly to common observation) they are as *Westminster-Abbey*, or even *St. Paul's* compared with the *Pantheon*, the *Coliseum*, the temple of *Theseus*, or other remains of architecture of the purest antiquity. Even the prints of them, those I mean done by the best hands, and which are not very rare, will explain and prove what I advance. In the *Parnassus* (one of the famous pictures of *Rafaelle* in the *Vatican*) *Dante* is represented as having his eye upon *Homer*. Had *Milton* been put there, *Homer*, and he ought to have been embracing each other. He knew him perfectly; it should not be said he copied, he imitated him, but that they both wrote by the self-same poetical genius. What is purely *Milton's* own, is equal at least to the best of that prince of poets; and when he profits himself of what he has done, it is with equal beauty and propriety. A simile, for instance, in *Paradise Lost*, shines no less than in the *Iliad* of the *Odyssey*; and some of *Milton's* have the same peculiarity as we find in some of *Homer*, they strike firmly on the point they are directed to, and the main business being done, the poet gives the rein a little to fancy, entertaining his reader with what is not otherwise to the purpose. . . . Whatever *Milton* has woven into his poem of others, still his sublimest passages are more so than could enter the heart of *Orpheus*, *Hesiod*, *Homer*, *Pindar*, *Callimachus*, &c. such as the heathen world were incapable of by infinite degrees, such as none but the noblest genius could attain to, and that assisted by a religion revealed by God himself. We have then in *Paradise Lost* a collection, the quintessence of all that is excellent in writing, frequently improved and explained, better than by the best of their professed commentators, but never debased; and a sublimity, which all other human writings put together have not. To compleat all, he has made use of all these, so as to be subservient to the great end of poetry, which is to please and enrich the imagination, and to mend the heart, and make the man happy."

Mr. Warburton, in his "*Divine Legation of Moses*," observes^a, that *Milton* produced "a third species of poetry; for just as *Virgil* rivalled *Homer*, so *Milton* emulated both. He found *Homer* possessed of the province of morality, *Virgil* of politics, and nothing left for him but that of religion. This he seized, as aspiring to share with them in the government of the poetic world; and by means of the superior dignity of his subject, got to the head of that triumvirate, which took so many ages in forming. These are the three species of the epic poem; for its largest province is human action, which can be considered but in a moral, a political, or religious view; and these the three great creators of them; for each of these poems was struck out at a heat, and came to perfection from its first essay. Here then the grand scene is closed, and all further improvements of the epic at an end."

But the concurrent applauses of all persons of true taste did not secure this admirable poem from an unexampled attempt to blast the reputation of it, upon the pretence of its being formed from the plagiarism of various modern authors, most of them unknown to the present age. This assertion was first started in *London*, in the beginning of *May 1746*, by *Mr. William Lauder*, a *Scotsman*, known some years before by an edition of *Dr. Arthur Johnston's Latin version of the Psalms*. It was afterwards made more public in the "*Gentleman's Magazine*," and at last maintained with great zeal and protestations of sincerity, in an "*Essay on Milton's use and imitation of the moderns*," printed at *London* in *1750*. in *8vo*." But the world was soon satisfied by a learned country-

^a B. II. Sect. 4. p. 188.

man of his, the reverend Mr. Douglas, Rector of Eton-Constantine in Shropshire, in his pamphlet, intitled, "Milton vindicated"; that this high charge of plagiarism, brought against our poet, was grounded only upon the forgeries and falsifications of the accuser, who had interpolated those authors, from whom he pretended that Milton had borrowed, and inserted in them passages, which he had himself taken from Hog's translation of "Paradise Lost," and the detection of the Imposture was so far from being attended with a proper sense of guilt to the author, that he set his invention again to work for various and inconsistent reasons to justify it.

In 1670 Milton published at London in 4to, his "History of Britain, that part especially now called England. From the first traditional beginning, continued to the Norman conquest. Collected out of the antientest and best authors thereof." It is reprinted in the first volume of Dr. Kennet's complete history of England; but Mr. Toland observes^a, that "we have not this history as it came out of the author's hands; for the licensers, those sworn officers to destroy learning, liberty, and good sense, expunged several passages of it, wherein he exposed the superstition, pride, and cunning of the popish monks in the Saxon times, but which were applied by the sagacious licensers to Charles the second's bishops." Milton bestowed a copy of the unlicensed papers on the earl of Anglesea, who, as well as several of the nobility and gentry, was his constant visiter^b; and 1681 a considerable passage, which had been suppressed in the publication of this history, was printed at London, in 4to, under the following title: "Mr. John Milton's character of the Long Parliament and assembly of Divines in MDCXLI. Omitted in his other works, and never before printed, and very seasonable for these times." To this is prefixed a preface to the reader, which is as follows: "The reader may take notice, that this character of Mr. Milton's was a part of his "History of Britain," and by him designed to be printed; but out of tenderness to a party (whom neither this nor much more lenity has had the luck to oblige) it was struck out for some harshness, being only such a digression, as the history itself would not be discomposed by its omission: which, I suppose, will be easily discerned by reading over the beginning of the Third Book of the said history, very near which place this character is to come in. It is reported (and from the foregoing character it seems probable) that Mr. Milton had lent most of his personal estate upon the public faith; which when he somewhat earnestly and warmly pressed to have restored, (observing how all in offices had not only feathered their own nests, but had enriched many of their relations and creatures, before the publick debts were discharged,) after a long and chargeable attendance, met with very sharp rebukes; upon which at last despairing of any success in this affair, he was forced to return from them poor and friendless, having spent all his money, and wearied all his friends. And he had not probably mended his worldly condition in those days, but by performing such service for them, as afterwards he did, for which scarce any thing would appear too great." Mr. Warburton, in his letter to me of observations on Milton, having observed, "that his English prose Stile has in it something very singular and original; and has grandeur, and force, and fire, but is quite unnatural, the idiom and turn of the period being Latin;" remarks, that "it is best suited to his English History, this air of antique giving a good grace to it;" and that this history "is written with great simplicity, contrary to his custom in his prose works, and is the better for it. But he sometimes rises to a surprizing grandeur in the sentiment and expression."

His "Paradise Regained and his Samson Agonistes," were licensed on the 2d of July, 1670, but were not printed till the year following at London, in 8vo. This poem was translated into French, and printed at Paris 1730 in 12mo, under the title of, "Le Paradis reconquis, traduit de l'Anglois de Milton; avec quelques autres pieces de Poësies." The four pieces, which the translator has added, are Lycidas, Allegro,

^a L. c. of Milton, p. 43.

^b Id. Ibid.

Il Penferoso, and the Ode on Christ's Nativity. Though *Paradise Regained* was generally esteemed much inferior to *Paradise Lost*; this Milton could not endure to hear, being quite of another mind.^a Father Nicéron^b objects to the title of *Paradise Regained*, as not a just one, since the subject of the poem is the conquest of Christ over Satan in the Desert. Mr. Warburton styles this "a charming poem, nothing inferior in the poetry and sentiments to the *Paradise Lost*; but considered as a just composition in the epic Poem, infinitely inferior, and indeed no more an epic poem than his *Manfius*." The author of the *Lettres Critiques* above cited observes^c, that "if there are not so many surprizing beauties in this poem, as in *Paradise Lost*, yet there are fewer faults, and those less gross ones." And the reverend and learned Mr. Jortin^d is of opinion, that our author's *Paradise regained* "has not met with the approbation that it deserves. It has not the harmony of numbers, the sublimity of thought, and the beauties of diction, which are in *Paradise Lost*. It is composed in a lower and less striking stile, a stile suited to the subject. Artful sophistry, false reasoning set off in the most specious manner, and refuted by the son of God with strong unaffected eloquence, is the peculiar excellence of this poem. Satan there defends a bad cause with great skill and subtilty, as one thoroughly versed in that craft:

Qui facere assuerat
Candida de nigris, & de candentibus atra.

His character is well drawn." In 1732, there was printed at London, in 4to, a Critique on this Poem, pointing out the beauties of it, written by Mr. Richard Meadowcourt, Fellow of Merton-College, and prebendary of Worcester.

With regard to the tragedy of *Samson Agonistes*, we may learn the opinion of bishop Atterbury concerning it from his letter to Mr. Pope, dated June 15th, 1722, who writes thus: "I hope you will not forget what passed in the coach about *Samson Agonistes*. I shan't press you as to time, but some time or other I wish you would review and polish that piece. If upon a new perusal of it (which I desire you to make) you think as I do, that it is written in the very spirit of the ancients; it deserves your care, and is capable of being improved with little trouble into a perfect model and standard of tragic poetry; always allowing for its being a story taken out of the Bible, which is an objection, that at this time of day, I know is not to be got over." That prelate's design was to have prevailed upon Mr. Pope to divide this tragedy into acts and scenes, and to have it acted by the king's scholars at Westminster. But his own imprisonment prevented the execution of that scheme.^e Mr. Warburton thinks, that this tragedy, as well as *Paradise Lost* and the *Mask*, "is a perfect piece; and as an imitation of the ancients, has, as it were, a certain gloominess intermixed with the sublime (the subject not very different, the fall of two heroes by a woman) which shines more serenely in his *Paradise Lost*."

In 1672 our author published at London, in 12mo, "*Artis Logicæ plenior institutio ad Petri Rami Methodum concinnata*"; and the year following, an excellent discourse, intitled, "Of true religion, Hæresie, Schism, Toleration, and what best means may be used against the growth of Popery. The author J. M. London 1673, in 4to." He published likewise the same year, *Poems, &c.* upon several occasions. By Mr. John Milton. Both English and Latin, &c. Composed at several times. With a small tractate of Education to Mr. Hartlib. London 1673, in 8vo." This volume contains all the poems printed in the edition of 1645, with the addition of several others; but

^a Toland p. 43.
Edit. Paris 1731.
London 1734.

^b *Memoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres*, Tom. X. Part II. p. 115.
^c Lettre VI. p. 251.
^d Remarks on Spenser's Poems, p. 171, &c. Ed.
^e Newton's Life of Milton, p. 62.

in both these editions are omitted a sonnet to Fairfax, another to Cromwell, another to Sir Henry Vane the younger, and that to Cyriac Skinner on his blindness, which were first printed by Mr. Philips at the end of his life of Milton, and prefixed to the English translation of our author's state-letters. We shall insert from the manuscript of Milton above quoted a collation of it with the printed copies of some of his poems.

Part of a MASK E.

- Less than half we find exprest;
 Envy bid conceal the rest.
- MS. "Less than halfe she hath exprest;
 Envie bid her hide the rest."
 Sitting like a goddess bright.
- MS. "Seated like a goddesse bright"
 Who had thought this clime hath held.
- MS. "Who would have thought this clime had held."
 What shallow-searching Fame had left untold.
- MS. "Those virtues which dull Fame hath left untold."
 For know by lot from Jove I am the power.
- MS. "For know by lot from Jove I have the power."
 Hath lock'd up mortal sense.
- MS. "Hath chain'd mortalitie."

At a solemn Musick.

- Wed your divine sounds, and mixt power employ, &c.
- MS. "Mixe your choise words, and happiest sounds employ,
 " And as your equall raptures tempered sweet
 " In high misterious spoufall meet,
 " Snatch us from earth a while,
 " Us of our woes beguile,
 " And to our high-rays'd phantasie præsent
 " That undisturbed song, &c.
 May rightly answer, &c.
- MS. "May rightly answere that melodious noise,
 " By leaving out those harsh illfounding jarres
 " Of clamourous sin, that all our musick marres;
 " And in our lives and in our song
 " May keepe in tune with heaven, till God ere long
 " To his celestial consort us unite
 " To live and sing with him in endlesse morne of light.

On TIME.

MS. "To be set on a Clock-Cafe."

The Sonnet, which begins thus, Captain, or Colonel, hath this Title, "On his Dore, when the citty expected an assault; or, When the assault was intended against the citty, 1642.

In the Sonnet, beginning, Lady, that in the prime, instead of this verse,
 And at thy growing vertues fret their Spleen,

he

he had written at first,

And instead of " And at thy blooming vertue fret their spleen."

Passes to blifs at the mid hour of night,

he had written,

" Opens the Dore of blifs, that howre of night."

His Sonnet to Mr. H. Lawes was at first written thus :

To my friend Mr. Hen. Lawes, Feb. 9. 1645.

MS. " Harry, whose tunefull and well-measured song
 " First taught our English music how to span
 " Words with just notes, when most were wont to scan
 " With Midas eares, misjoyning short and long ;
 " Thy worth and skill exempts thee from the throng,
 " And gives thee praise above the pipe of Pan :
 " To after age thou shalt be writt a man,
 " That didst reform thy art, the chief among.
 " Thou honourst vers, and vers must lend her wing |
 " To honour thee, the priest of Phœbus quire,
 " That tun'st thir happiest lines in hymn or story..
 " Fame, by the Tuscan's leav, shall set thee higher
 " Than old Casell, whom Dante won to sing
 " Met in the milder shades of purgatory."

His sonnet, which begins, " I did but prompt the age, &c." has this title in the manuscript: " On the detraction which followed upon my writing certain treatises;" and instead of this line,

And still revolt, when truth would set them free,

he had written

" And hate the truth wherby they should be free,

The sonnet beginning, " When Faith and Love, &c. has this title, " On the religious memorie of Mrs. Catharine Thomson, my christian freind deceased, 16 December 1646 ; and instead of these lines,

Meekly thou didst resigne this earthly Load
 Of Death, call'd Life, &c.

he had written

MS. " Meekly thou didst resigne this earthly Clod
 " Of flesh and sin, which man from Heav'n doth sever.
 " Thy works and alms, and all thy good endeavor
 " Strait follow'd thee the path that saints have trod,
 " Still as they journey'd from this dark abode
 " Up to the realm of peace and joy for ever.
 " Faith, who led on the way, and knew them best.
 " Thy handmaids, &c."

In the sonnet beginning, " A book was writ of late," he had written,

MS. " I writt a book of late call'd Tetrachordon,
 " And weav'd it close both matter, form, and stile :
 " It went off well about the town awhile,
 " Numbering good, &c."

An Account of the Life and Writings

In the verses upon "the forcers of conscience," instead of this line,
 To seize the widdowed Whore plurality,
 he had written the vacant whore; instead of To force our consciences, "the consciences"
 instead of shallow Edwards, "haire brain'd"; instead of
 Clip your phylacteries, though bauk your ears,
 MS. "Crop yee as close as marginall P——s ears."
 and instead of When they shall read this, "When you shall read this, &c."

The sonnet to Sir Thomas Fairfax had this title: "On the lord general Fairfax
 at the siege of Colchester; and in that sonnet, instead of these lines,

———— while new rebellions raise
 Their Hydra heads, and the false North displays
 Her broken league to imp her servant-wings,

 And public faith be rescued from the brand:

he had written,

MS. "———— though new rebellions raise
 " Their Hydra-heads, and the false North displays
 " Her broken league to impe their serpent-wings.
 "
 " And public faith clear'd from the shameful brand."

The sonnet to Cromwell had this title: "To the Lord General Cromwell, May
 1652. On the Proposals of certain ministers at the committee for propagation of the
 gospel."

In the sonnet to Sir Henry Vane, instead of these lines,

———— Besides to know
 Both spiritual and civil, what each means,
 What serves each, thou hast learn'd, which few have done.
 The bounds of either sword to thee we owe;
 Therefore on thy right hand religion leans,
 And reckons thee in chief her eldest son:

he had written:

MS. "———— Besides to know
 " What Pow're the church and what the civil means
 " Thou teachest best, which few have ever don.
 " The bounds of either sword to thee we owe.
 " Therefore on thy firme hand religion leans
 " In peace, and reckons thee her eldest son."

In the sonnet to Mr. Cyriac Skinner, upon his blindness, instead of these lines,

Against Heaven's hand or will, nor bate one jot
 Of heart or hope, but still bear up and steer
 Right onward:

he had written,

MS. "Against God's hand or will, nor bate a jot
 " Of heart or hope, but still attend to steer
 " Uphillward."

In 1674 his "*Epistolarum Familiarium Lib. I.*" and "*Prolusiones quædam Oratoriæ in Collegio Christi habitæ,*" were printed at London in 8vo. Besides the works already mentioned, he was prevailed upon by the Danish resident to get his state-letters transcribed, which were printed at London in 1676, in 12mo; and translated into English, and printed at London 1694. He translated likewise out of Latin into English the declaration of the Poles concerning the election of their king John III. which translation was printed at London 1674, in 4to; and wrote, "*The brief history of Moscovie, and of their less known countries lying eastward of Russia as far as Cathay;*" printed at London 1682, in 8vo.

He died at his house in Bunhill-Row November 15th, according to Mr. Richard Smith, his neighbour, in his Obituary^a; though Mr. Wood tells us^b, that it was on the 9th, or 10th of that month, which is the more probable, since he was buried, according to the parish register, on the 12th of that month. He died of the gout, but with so little pain, that the time of his expiring was not perceived by those in the room. His body was interred near that of his father in the chancel of the church of St. Giles's Cripplegate, being attended by a great number of his friends^c. Mr. Fenton observes^d, that he had desired a friend of his to enquire at that church, whether there was any monument there to Milton's memory; and the sexton shewed a small one, which he said was supposed to be our author's; but the inscription had never been legible since he was employed in that office, which he had possessed above forty years. "This sure could never have happened," says Mr. Fenton, "in so short a space of time, unless the epitaph had been industriously erased; and that supposition carries with it so much inhumanity, that I think we ought to believe it was not erected to his memory."

In his youth he is said to have been extremely handsome, and while he was a student at Cambridge, he was called "*the Lady of Christ's-College,*" and he took notice of this himself in one of his public Prolusions before that university; "*A quibusdam audiui nuper domina*"^e. The colour of his hair was a light brown; the symmetry of his features exact; enlivened with an agreeable air, and a beautiful mixture of fair and ruddy; which occasioned John Baptista Manso to give his epigram upon him above quoted the same turn of thought, which Gregory archdeacon of Rome had employed above a thousand years before, in praising the amiable complexion of some English youths. But Mr. Wood observes, that "*his eyes were none of the quickest.*" His stature, as we find it measured by himself^f, did not exceed the middle-size; he was neither too lean, nor too corpulent; his limbs well proportioned, nervous, and active, serviceable in all respects to his exercising the sword, in which he much delighted, and wanted neither skill, nor courage, to resent an affront from men of the most athletic constitutions. In his diet he was abstemious; not delicate in the choice of his dishes; and strong liquors of all kinds were his aversion. Being too sadly convinced how much his health had suffered by night-studies in his younger years, he used to go early (seldom later than nine) to rest; and rose commonly in the summer at four, and in the winter at five in the morning; but when he was not disposed to rise at his usual hours, he always had one to read to him by his bed-side^g. At his first rising he had usually a chapter read to him out of the Hebrew bible; and he commonly studied all the morning till twelve, then used some exercise for an hour, afterwards dined, and after dinner played on the organ, and either sung himself, or made his wife sing, who, he said, had a good voice, but no

^a An extract of which is printed by Francis Peck, M. A. in the second volume of his *Desiderata Curiosa*, B. XIV. p. 48. Edit. London 1736, in fol.

^b *Fasti Oxon.* Vol. I. Col. 266.

^c *Id. ibid.*

^d *Id. ibid.* and Philips, p. 41, and Toland, p. 46.

^e Postscript to the Life of Milton.

^f P. 132.

Edit. 1674.

^g Wood, *ubi supra*.

^h *Defensio Secunda*, p. 41. Edit. 1654.

ⁱ Wood,

Col. 266. Toland p. 46. and Fenton, p. 24.

ear, and then he went up to study again till six, when his friends came to visit him, and sat with him till eight. Then he went down to supper; which was usually olives or some light thing; and after supper he smoked his pipe, and drank a glass of water, and went to bed^a. When his blindness restrained him from other exercises, he had a machine to swing in for the preservation of his health; and diverted himself in his chamber with playing on an organ. He had a delicate ear, and excellent voice, and great skill in vocal and instrumental music. His deportment was erect, open, and affable; and his conversation easy, chearful, and instructive.

The extent of his genius and universality of his learning are sufficiently evident in his writings; and his knowledge of the ancient and modern languages enabled him to read and improve by all the valuable writers in them. His favourite author was Homer, whom he could almost repeat, and had been advised to translate into English. But as he observes himself in his postscript to the judgment of Martin Bucer, "he could never delight in long citations, much less in whole translations; whether it be, added he, my natural disposition, or education in me, or that my mother bore me a speaker of what God made my own, and not a translator."

As he looked upon true and absolute freedom to be the greatest happiness of this life, whether to societies or single persons, so he thought constraint of any sort to be the utmost misery; for which reason he used frequently to tell those about him of the intire satisfaction of his mind, that he had constantly employed his strength and faculties in the defence of liberty, and in direct opposition to slavery^b. And his aversion to monarchy, as he told his friend Sir Robert Howard, was heightened by this consideration, that the trappings of it might support an ordinary commonwealth.^c However his service under Cromwell has been thought by many a great inconsistency with the zeal, which he professed for liberty; since it is certain, that Cromwell's assuming the protectorship was a shocking usurpation over the rights and liberties of the nation, and rendered him detestable to almost all the republican party. But upon this head it may be alledged, that the office, which he held under the protector, was not received from him, but had been enjoyed by him under the commonwealth, and was one, that related to the public, more than to the private interests of Cromwell, in whose confidence he does not appear to have been, during his whole government, there being no trace of his activity, in all the vast collection of secretary Thurloe's papers. He took the freedom likewise to give some excellent advice to that great man, against assuming an exorbitant authority, in his "Defensio Secunda," in the following address to him.^d "You have justly rejected the title of king; for if you, who, when a private person, was able to reduce it to nothing, should, now you are so highly advanced, be captivated with it, it would be exactly the same case, as if after having, by the assistance of the true God, subdued an idolatrous nation, you should worship the deities, which you had conquered. Consider often with yourself, that your country has intrusted you with her dearest pledge, that of her liberty. Regard the great expectations conceived of you; reflect, that your country's hope is intirely from you; regard the countenances and wounds of so many brave men, who, under your conduct, have fought for liberty; regard the Manes of those, who have died in battle; regard what foreign nations may think and say of us, and the great things which they have promised themselves from our noble acquisition of liberty, and our new commonwealth so gloriously begun to be established, which, if it prove abortive, will be the greatest infamy to this nation; lastly, regard your own character, and never suffer that liberty, for which you have passed through so many toils and dangers, to be violated by yourself, or in any measure lessened by others. You cannot be free yourself,

^a Dr. Newton's Life of Milton, p. lxxviii, 2d Edit. 1750. 8vo.

^b Toland, p. 46.

^c New-

ton's life of Milton, p. lxxii, 2d Edit.

^d *Defensio Secunda*, 152, & seqq. Edit. 1654.

unless we are free; for such is the necessary constitution of things, that whoever invades the liberty of others, first of all loses his own, and will be first sensible of his own being a slave. But if he, who has been the patron, and as it were tutular deity of liberty, and been esteemed a man of the greatest sanctity and probity, should usurp over that liberty, which he has defended; it will be a pernicious and almost fatal wound, not only to his reputation, but even to that of virtue and piety in general. Honesty and virtue will seem to be lost; Religion will have little regard paid to it; and reputation will ever after be of small account; than which no greater misfortune can befall mankind."

He ever expressed the profoundest reverence to the Deity as well in deeds as words; and would say to his friends, that the divine properties of goodness, justice, and mercy were the adequate rules of human actions, nor less the object of imitation for private advantage, than of admiration or respect for their own excellence and perfection. In his early years he was a favourer of the Puritans; in his middle age he was best pleased with the Independents and Anabaptists, as allowing of more liberty than others, and coming nearest, in his opinion, to the primitive practice; but in the latter part of his life he was not a professed member of any particular sect among christians; he frequented none of their assemblies, nor made use of any of their peculiar rites in his family^a.

The estate, which his father left him, was a very moderate one; yet by his frugality he made it serve him and his. Out of his secretary's salary he saved 2000 l. which being lodged in the Excise, and that bank failing upon king Charles II's restoration, he utterly lost that sum^b. He lost likewise another great sum by mismanagement and for want of good advice^c. His house in Bread-street, which was all then remaining of his paternal estate, and which foreigners used to visit out of pure devotion, as Mr. Wood expresses it, was burnt in the fire of London^d. Towards the latter end of his life he contracted his library, both because the heirs he left could not make a right use of it, and that he thought he could sell it more to their advantage than they would be able to do themselves^e. He died worth 1500 l. in money, besides his household goods^f.

His three wives were all maidens, when he married them, he declaring in his "Apology for Smectymnuus," written before he was married, that he thought with them, who both in prudence and elegance of spirit, would chuse a virgin of mean fortune, happily bred, before the wealthiest widow." By his first wife he had four children, whose birth are thus registred by himself in the blank leaf of his wife's bible, whence I transcribed it^g. "Anne my daughter was born July the 29th, the day of the monthly fast, between six and seven, or about half an hour after six in the evening, 1646. Mary, my daughter, was born on Wednesday, October the 25th, on the fast-day in the morning, about six of the clock, 1648. My son John, was born on Saturday March the 16th, about half an hour past nine at night, 1650. My daughter Deborah was born the 2d of May, being Sunday, somewhat before three of the clock in the morning, 1652."

His three daughters survived him, and the two youngest used to read to him; the eldest being excused on account of the weakness of her constitution, and difficulty of speech; and they were taught by him to read and pronounce all the languages of whatever book he thought proper to read, though they were kept strangers to the sense of these languages; till at last upon their expressing some uneasiness at this employment,

^a Toland, p. 46.

^c Toland, p. 45, 46.

^b Wood, Col. 266.

^f Philips, p. 43.

^e Philips, p. 43.

^g January 6, 1749 50.

^d Wood, ubi *supra*.

their attendance was dispensed with^a, and they were sent out to learn some curious and ingenious arts proper for their sex, as embroidery in gold and silver.

His eldest daughter married a master-builder, and died in childbed of her first child, which died with her. The second lived single, and the third Deborah, who was married to Mr. Abraham Clarke, a Weaver in Spital-fields, and died August 24, 1727, in the 76th year of her age. She gave Dr. Ward, Professor of Rhetoric at Gresham-College, who saw her not long before her death, at the house of her relations, the following account, which he communicated to me, Feb. 10. 1737-8. "She informed me, that she and her sisters used to read to their father in eight languages; which by practice they were capable of doing with great readiness and accuracy, though they understood what they read in no other language but English; and their father used often to say in their hearing, 'one tongue was enough for a woman.' None of them were ever sent to school, but all taught at home by a mistress kept for that purpose. Isaiah, Homer, and Ovid's metamorphoses were books, which they were often called to read to their father; and at my desire she repeated a considerable number of verses from the beginning of both these poets with great readiness. I knew who she was, upon the first sight of her, by the similitude of her countenance with her father's picture. And upon my telling her so, she informed me, that Mr. Addison told her the same thing, upon her going to wait on him. For he, upon hearing she was living, sent for her, and desired, if she had any papers of her father's she would bring them with her, as an evidence of her being Mr. Milton's daughter. But immediately upon her being introduced to him, he said, 'Madam, you need no other voucher; your face is a sufficient testimonial whose daughter you are.' And he then made her a handsome present of a purse of guineas, with a promise of procuring her an annual provision for her life; but he dying soon after, she lost the benefit of his generous design. She appeared to be a woman of good sense and a genteel behaviour, and to bear the inconveniences of a low fortune with decency and prudence."

Mrs. Clarke had by her husband seven sons and three daughters. But none of them had any children, except one of her sons, Caleb, and the youngest daughter Elizabeth. Caleb went over to Fort St. George, in the East-Indies, where he married, and had two sons, Abraham and Isaac. Of these, Abraham the elder, came to England, with the late governor Harrison, but returned again upon the advice of his father's death; and whether he or his brother be now living, is uncertain. Mr. Urban Clarke, another of the sons of Deborah, was a weaver, and lived in Pelham-street Spital-fields, March 24, 1737-8; when I visited him and his sister, Mrs. Elizabeth Foster, the youngest daughter of Mrs. Clarke, and wife of Mr. Thomas Foster, by whom she had three sons and four daughters, who are all now dead. She removed from Pelham street, where she kept a Chandler's Shop, to lower Holloway, between Highgate and London, where she continued about seven years, and where her brother Urban died; and she now follows the same employment with her husband in Cock-lane, not far from Shoreditch-church. In my first visit to her on the 11th of February, 1737-8. she gave the following particulars, which she had often heard from her mother, Mrs. Clarke, who meeting with very ill treatment from Milton's last wife, left her father, and went to live with a lady, whom she called Merian. This lady going over to Ireland, and resolving to take Milton's daughter with her, if he would give his consent, wrote a letter to him of her design, and assured him, that "as chance had thrown his daughter under her care, she would treat her no otherwise than as his daughter and her own companion." She lived with that lady, till her marriage, and came over again to England during the troubles in Ireland, under king James II. Milton's widow, though she owned, that he died worth

^a Philips, p. 41, 42.

1500 l. yet allowed his three daughters but 100 l. each. Mrs. Foster informed me, that Milton's father was born in France. That Milton lost 2000 l. by a money-scrivener, whom he had intrusted with it; and that an estate of about 60 l. per Ann. at Westminster was taken away from him at the restoration, it belonging to the dean and chapter there. That his second wife did not die in childbed,* as Mr. Philips and Toland relate, but above three months after of a consumption. That he kept his daughters at a great distance; and would not allow them to learn to write, which he thought unnecessary for a woman. That he seldom went abroad in the latter part of his life, but was constantly visited even then by persons of distinction, both foreigners and others. That there were three pictures of him; the first, painted while he was at school, which is that now in the possession of Charles Stanhope Esq; the second, when he was about twenty-five or twenty-six years of age; and the third, when he was pretty well advanced in age. That her late majesty queen Caroline sent his daughter, Mrs. Clarke, fifty pounds: and that she received other presents of money from several gentlemen.

Dr. Newton in a later visit to Mrs. Foster about two years ago, was informed by her, that Milton was very temperate in his eating and drinking, but what he had, he always chose to have of the best: that her mother inherited his head-achs and disorders, and had such a weakness in her eyes, that she was forced to make use of spectacles from the age of eighteen; and she herself, she says, has not been able to read a chapter in the bible these twenty years. She told the Doctor likewise, that she was mistaken in informing me, that Milton's father was born in France. She knows nothing of the descendants of her aunt Philipot or Agur, but believes they are all extinct; as likewise is Sir Christopher Milton's family, the last of which, she says, were two maiden sisters, Mrs. Mary and Mrs. Catharine Milton, who lived at Highgate, and are both dead, one dying at Mrs. Foster's house at Holloway: but unknown to her, there is a Mrs. Milton living in Grosvenor's-street, the grand-daughter of Sir Christopher, and the daughter of Mr. Thomas Milton before-mentioned. Mrs. Foster is the only survivor of our poet's family, unless there be some in the East-Indies, which she very much questions, having heard nothing from them for several years.

The account, which Dr. Newton gave of her, in his life of her grandfather, occasioned Comus to be acted on Thursday April 5, 1750. for her benefit, with a prologue by the learned and ingenious Mr. Samuel Johnson; which brought her clear about 130 l.

The arms that Milton used, and sealed his letters with, were Argent a spread eagle, with two heads gules, legg'd and beak'd sable.

Besides the writings abovementioned, and an Idea Theologiæ mentioned by Wood to have been in the hands of Milton's friend Cyriac Skinner, of Mark lane, he had prepared for the press an answer to some little scribbling Quack in London, who had written a scurrilous libel against him: but either by the dissuasion of friends, as thinking him a fellow not worth notice, or for what other cause is not known, this answer was never published.

Milton has been very injuriously treated by the anonymous author of "*Remarques critiques sur la nouvelle edition de dictionnaire historique de Moreri donnée en 1704*," in the second edition of the book published by Monsr. Bayle at Amsterdam 1706 in 12mo. for this writer represents him, not only as a man absolutely without the least religion, but likewise as a wretched poet, and worse orator. But such a judgment is a reproach only to the person, who is rash enough to pass it.

A monument erected in 1737, to our author's memory in Westminster-Abbey, by William Benson Esq; one of the auditors of the imprest; and the public honours paid

* Wood Fasti Oxon. Vol. I. Col. 262.

† P. 40.

to him, and the universal admiration, with which his works have been long read, justify what he foretold himself, in his ode * to Mr. Rouse library-keeper of the university of Oxford, concerning his own writings, even before some of the most considerable of them were composed ;

At ultimi nepotes,
Et cordatior ætas
Judicia rebus æquiora forsitan
Adhibebit integro sinu.
Tum livore sepulto,
Siquid meremur, sana Posteritas sciet.

* Dated Jan. 23d, 1646.

OF
REFORMATION
IN
ENGLAND,
AND

The CAUSES that hitherto have hindred it.

In TWO BOOKS. Written to a FRIEND.

SIR,

AMIDST those deep and retired thoughts, which with every man christianly instructed, ought to be most frequent of God, and of his miraculous Ways and Works amongst men, and of our Religion and Works, to be performed to him; after the story of our Saviour Christ, suffering to the lowest bent of weakness in the Flesh, and presently triumphing to the highest pitch of Glory in the Spirit, which drew up his body also, till we in both be united to him in the revelation of his kingdom: I do not know of any thing more worthy to take up the whole passion of pity on the one side, and joy on the other, than to consider first, the foul and sudden corruption, and then after many a tedious age, the long deferred, but much more wonderful and happy reformation of the Church in these latter days. Sad it is to think how that doctrine of the Gospel, planted by teachers divinely inspired, and by them winnowed and sifted from the chaff of over-dated ceremonies, and refined to such a spiritual height and temper of purity, and knowledge of the Creator, that the body, with all the circumstances of time and place, were purified by the affections of the regenerate soul, and nothing left impure but sin; Faith needing not the weak, and fallible office of the senses, to be either the ushers or interpreters of heavenly mysteries, save where our Lord himself in his sacraments ordained: that such a doctrine should, through the grossness and blindness of her professors, and the fraud of deceivable traditions, drag so downwards, as to backslide one way into the Jewish beggary of old cast rudiments, and stumble forward another way into the new-vomited paganism of sensual idolatry, attributing purity or impurity to things indifferent, that they might bring the inward acts of the Spirit to the outward and customary eye-service of the body, as if they could make God earthly and fleshly, because they could not make themselves heavenly and spiritual; they began to draw down all the divine intercourse betwixt God and the soul, yea, the very shape of God himself, into an exterior and bodily form, urgently pretending a necessity and obligation of joining the body in a formal reverence, and Worship circumscribed; they hallowed it, they fumed it, they sprinkled it, they bedecked it, not in robes of pure innocence, but of pure linnen, with other deform-

ed and fantastick drestes, in palls and mitres, gold, and guegaws fetched from Aaron's old wardrobe, or the Flamins Vestry: then was the Priest set to con his Motions and his Postures, his Liturgies and his Luries, till the soul by this means of over-bodying herself, given up justly to fleshly delights, bated her wing apace downward: and finding the ease she had from her visible and sensuous colleague the body, in performance of religious duties, her pinions now broken, and flagging, shifted off from herself the labour of high soaring any more, forgot her heavenly flight, and left the dull and droiling carcase to plod on in the old road, and drudging trade of outward conformity. And here out of question from her perverse conceiting of God and holy things, she had fallen to believe no God at all, had not custom and the worm of conscience nipt her incredulity: hence to all the duties of evangelical grace, instead of the adoptive and chearful boldness which our new alliance with God requires, came servile, and thrall-like fear: for in very deed, the superstitious man by his good will is an atheist; but being scared from thence by the pangs and gripes of a boiling conscience, all in a pudder shuffles up to himself such a God, and such a worship as is most agreeable to remedy his fear; which fear of his, as also is his hope, fixed only upon the Flesh, renders likewise the whole faculty of his apprehension carnal; and all the inward acts of Worship, issuing from the native strength of the soul, run out lavishly to the upper skin, and there harden into a crust of formality. Hence men came to scan the Scriptures by the letter, and in the covenant of our redemption, magnified the external signs more than the quickning power of the Spirit; and yet looking on them through their own guiltiness with a servile fear, and finding as little comfort, or rather terror from them again, they knew not how to hide their slavish approach to God's behests by them not understood, nor worthily received, but by cloaking their servile crouching to all religious presentments, sometimes lawful, sometimes idolatrous, under the name of Humility, and terming the pye-bald frippery, and ostentation of ceremonies, decency.

Then was baptism changed into a kind of exorcism, and water, sanctified by Christ's institute, thought little enough to wash off the original spot without the scratch, or cross impression of a priest's fore-finger: and that feast of free-grace and adoption to which Christ invited his disciples to sit as brethren, and co-heirs of the happy covenant, which at that table was to be sealed to them, even that feast of love and heavenly-admitted fellowship, the seal of filial grace, became the subject of horror, and glouting adoration, pageanted about like a dreadful idol: which sometimes deceives well-meaning men, and beguiles them of their reward, by their voluntary humility; which indeed is fleshly pride, preferring a foolish sacrifice, and the rudiments of the world, as Saint Paul to the Colossians explaineth, before a savory obedience to Christ's example. [Such was Peter's unseasonable Humility, as then his knowledge was small, when Christ came to wash his feet; who at an impertinent time would needs strain courtesy with his master, and falling troublesomely upon the lowly, all-wise, and unexaminable intention of Christ, in what he went with resolution to do, so provoked by his interruption the meek Lord, that he threatened to exclude him from his heavenly portion, unless he could be content to be less arrogant and stiff-necked in his humility.

But to dwell no longer in characterizing the Depravities of the Church, and how they sprung, and how they took increase; when I recall to mind at last, after so many dark ages, wherein the huge over-shadowing train of Error had almost swept all the stars out of the firmament of the Church; how the bright and blisful Reformation (by divine power) strook through the black and settled night of Ignorance and Antichristian Tyranny, methinks a sovereign and reviving joy must needs rush into the bosom of him that reads or hears; and the sweet odour of the returning Gospel imbathe his soul with the fragrancy of heaven. Then was the sacred Bible sought out of the dusty corners where profane falsehood and neglect had thrown it, the Schools opened, divine and human Learning raked out of the Embers of forgotten Tongues, the Princes and Cities trooping apace to the new-

new-erected banner of Salvation; the Martyrs, with the unresistable Might of Weakness, shaking the Powers of Darkness, and scorning the fiery Rage of the old red Dragon.

The pleasing pursuit of these thoughts hath oft-times led me into a serious question and debatement with myself, how it should come to pass that England (having had this Grace and Honour from God, to be the first that should set up a standard for the recovery of lost Truth, and blow the first Evangelick Trumpet to the Nations, holding up, as from a hill, the new lamp of saving Light to all Christendom) should now be last, and most unsettled in the enjoyment of that Peace, whereof she taught the way to others; although indeed our Wickliffe's preaching, at which all the succeeding Reformers more effectually lighted their Tapers, was to his countrymen but a short blaze, soon damp't and stifled by the Pope and Prelates for six or seven kings reigns; yet methinks the Precedency which God gave this Island, to be first Restorer of buried Truth, should have been followed with more happy success, and sooner attained perfection; in which as yet we are amongst the last: for, albeit in Purity of Doctrine we agree with our brethren; yet in discipline, which is the execution and applying of Doctrine home, and laying the Salve to the very Orifice of the Wound, yea, tenting and searching to the Core, without which Pulpit-preaching is but shooting at rovers; in this we are no better than a Schism from all the Reformation, and a sore scandal to them: for while we hold Ordination to belong only to Bishops, as our Prelates do, we must of necessity hold also their Ministers to be no Ministers, and shortly after their Church to be no Church. Not to speak of those senseless Ceremonies which we only retain, as a dangerous earnest of sliding back to Rome, and serving merely, either as a mist to cover nakedness where true Grace is extinguished, or as an Enterlude to set out the Pomp of Prelatism. Certainly it would be worth the while therefore, and the pains, to enquire more particularly, what, and how many the chief causes have been, that have still hindred our uniform Consent to the rest of the Churches abroad, at this time especially when the Kingdom is in a good propensity thereto; and all men in prayers, in hopes, or in disputes, either for or against it.

Yet I will not insist on that which may seem to be the cause on God's part; as his judgment on our sins, the trial of his own, the unmasking of hypocrites: nor shall I stay to speak of the continual eagerness and extreme diligence of the Pope and Papists to stop the furtherance of Reformation, which know they have no hold or hope of England their lost darling, longer than the government of Bishops bolsters them out; and therefore plot all they can to uphold them, as may be seen by the book of Santa Clara the popish Priest in defence of Bishops, which came out piping hot much about the time that one of our own Prelates, out of an ominous fear had writ on the same Argument; as if they had joined their forces, like good confederates, to support one falling Babel.

But I shall chiefly endeavour to declare those causes that hinder the forwarding of true Discipline, which are among ourselves. Orderly proceeding will divide our inquiry into our Forefather's Days, and into our Times. Henry VIII. was the first that rent this Kingdom from the Pope's subjection totally; but his quarrel being more about Supremacy, than other faultiness in Religion that he regarded, it is no marvel if he stuck where he did. The next default was in the Bishops, who though they had renounced the Pope, they still hugged the Popedom, and shared the authority among themselves, by their six bloody Articles persecuting the Protestants no slacker than the Pope would have done. And doubtless, whenever the Pope shall fall, if his ruin be not like the sudden down-come of a tower, the Bishops, when they see him tottering, will leave him, and fall to scrambling, catch who may, he a Patriarchdom, and another what comes next hand; as the French cardinal of late, and the See of Canterbury hath plainly affected.

In Edward the Sixth's days, why a compleat Reformation was not effected, to any considerate man may appear. First, he no sooner entred into his kingdom, but into a war with Scotland; from whence the Protector returning with victory, had but newly put his hand to repeal the six Articles, and throw the images out of Churches, but rebellions on

all sides, stirred up by obdurate Papists, and other tumults, with a plain war in Norfolk, holding tack against two of the king's Generals, made them of force content themselves with what they had already done. Hereupon followed ambitious contentions among the Peers, which ceased not but with the Protector's death, who was the most zealous in this point: and then Northumberland was he that could do most in England, who little minding Religion, (as his apostacy well shewed at his death) bent all his wit how to bring the right of the Crown into his own line. And for the Bishops, they were so far from any such worthy attempts, as that they suffered themselves to be the common stales to countenance, with their prostituted gravities, every politick fetch that was then on foot, as oft as the potent Statists pleased to employ them. Never do we read that they made use of their authority and high place of access, to bring the jarring nobility to Christian Peace, or to withstand their disloyal projects: but if a toleration for Mass were to be begged of the king for his sister Mary, lest Charles the Fifth should be angry; who but the grave prelates, Cranmer and Ridley, must be sent to extort it from the young king? But out of the mouth of that godly and royal Child, Christ himself returned such an awful repulse to those halting and time-serving Prelates, that after much bold importunity, they went their way not without shame and tears.

Nor was this the first time that they discovered to be followers of this world; for when the Protector's brother, Lord Sudley, the admiral, through private malice and mal-engine was to lose his life, no man could be found fitter than Bishop Latimer (like another Dr. Shaw) to divulge in his sermon the forged accusations laid to his charge, thereby to defame him with the people, who else 'twas thought would take ill the innocent man's death, unless the reverend Bishop could warrant them there was no foul play. What could be more impious than to debar the children of the king from their right to the crown? To comply with the ambitious usurpation of a traitor, and to make void the last Will of Henry VIII. to which the breakers had sworn observance? Yet Bishop Cranmer, one of the executors, and the other Bishops none refusing, (lest they should resist the Duke of Northumberland) could find in their consciences to set their hands to the disinabling and defeating not only of Princess Mary the Papist, but of Elizabeth the Protestant, and (by the Bishops judgment) the lawful issue of King Henry.

Who then can think (tho' these Prelates had fought a further Reformation) that the least wry face of a Politician would not have husht them? But it will be said, These men were Martyrs: What then? though every true Christian will be a Martyr when he is called to it; not presently does it follow, that every one suffering for religion, is without exception. Saint Paul writes, that "a man may give his body to be burnt, (meaning for religion) and yet not have charity:" he is not therefore above all possibility of erring, because he burns for some points of truth.

Witness the * Arians and Pelagians, which were slain by the heathen for Christ's sake, yet we take both these for no true friends of Christ. If the Martyrs (saith Cyprian in his 30th epistle) decree one thing, and the Gospel another, either the Martyrs must lose their crown by not observing the Gospel for which they are Martyrs, or the majesty of the Gospel must be broken and lie flat, if it can be over-topt by the Novelty of any other Decree.

And here withal I invoke the Immortal Deity, Revealer and Judge of secrets, that wherever I have in this book plainly and roundly (though worthily and truly) laid open the faults and blemishes of Fathers, Martyrs, or Christian Emperors, or have otherwise inveighed against error and superstition with vehement expressions; I have done it, neither out of malice, nor list to speak evil, nor any vain-glory, but of mere necessity to vindi-

* It appears from this and other passages, that the author in his younger years, was Orthodox, as it is called: but he afterwards altered his sentiments; as is plain from his tract on "True Religion, Heresy, Schism, and Toleration," which was the last work he published.

cate the spotless Truth from an ignominious bondage, whose native worth is now become of such a low esteem, that she is like to find small credit with us for what she can say, unless she can bring a ticket from Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley; or prove herself a retainer to Constantine, and wear his Badge. More tolerable it were for the Church of God, that all these names were utterly abolished like the Brazen Serpent, than that men's fond opinion should thus idolize them, and the heavenly Truth be thus captivated.

Now to proceed, whatsoever the Bishops were, it seems they themselves were unsatisfied in matters of Religion as they then stood, by that commission granted to eight Bishops, eight other Divines, eight Civilians, eight common Lawyers, to frame Ecclesiastical Constitutions; which no wonder if it came to nothing, for (as Hayward relates) both their professions and their ends were different. Lastly, we all know by examples, that exact Reformation is not perfected at the first push, and those unwieldy times of Edward VI. may hold some plea by this excuse. Now let any reasonable man judge whether that king's reign be a fit time from whence to pattern out the constitution of a Church discipline, much less that it should yield occasion from whence to foster and establish the continuance of imperfection, with the commendatory subscriptions of Confessors and Martyrs, to intitle and engage a glorious Name to a gross Corruption. It was not Episcopacy that wrought in them the heavenly fortitude of Martyrdom, as little is it that Martyrdom can make good Episcopacy; but it was Episcopacy that led the good and holy men through the temptation of the Enemy, and the snare of this present world, to many blame-worthy and opprobrious Actions. And it is still Episcopacy that before all our eyes worsens and flugs the most learned, and seeming religious of our Ministers, who no sooner advanced to it, but like a seething-pot set to cool, sensibly exhale and reek out the greatest part of that zeal, and those gifts which were formerly in them, settling in a skinny congealment of ease and sloth at the top: and if they keep their learning by some potent sway of nature, 'tis a rare chance; but their Devotion most commonly comes to that queazy temper of lukewarmness, that gives a vomit to God himself.

But what do we suffer mis-shapen and enormous Prelatism, as we do, thus to blanch and varnish her deformities with the fair colours, as before of Martyrdom, so now of Episcopacy? They are not Bishops, God and all good Men know they are not, that have filled this land with late confusion and violence, but a tyrannical crew and corporation of impostors that have blinded and abused the world so long under that name. He that enabled with gifts from God, and the lawful and primitive choice of the Church assembled in convenient number, faithfully from that time forward feeds his parochial Flock, has his coequal and presbyterial power to ordain Ministers and Deacons by publick Prayer, and Vote of Christ's congregation in like sort as he himself was ordained, and is a true Apostolick Bishop. But when he steps up into the chair of Pontifical pride, and changes a moderate and exemplary house for a misgoverned and haughty Palace, spiritual Dignity for carnal Precedence, and secular high Office and Employment for the high Negotiations of his heavenly Embassage: then he degrades, then he unbishops himself; he that makes him Bishop, makes him no Bishop. No marvel therefore if St. Martin complained to Sulpitius Severus, that since he was Bishop he felt inwardly a sensible decay of those Virtues and Graces that God had given him in great measure before; although the same Sulpitius write that he was nothing tainted or altered in his Habit, Diet, or personal Demeanor from that simple plainness to which he first betook himself. It was not therefore that thing alone which God took displeasure at in the Bishops of those times, but rather an universal rottenness and gangrene in the whole Function.

From hence then I pass to Queen Elizabeth, the next Protestant Prince, in whose days why Religion attained not a perfect reducement in the beginning of her reign, I suppose the hindring causes will be found to be common with some formerly alledged for King Edward VI. the greenness of the times, the weak estate which Queen Mary left the realm in, the great places and offices executed by Papists, the Judges, the Lawyers, the Justices

of peace for the most part Popish, the Bishops firm to Rome; from whence was to be expected the furious flashing of excommunications, and absolving the People from their obedience. Next, her private Counsellors, whoever they were, persuaded her (as Camden writes) that the altering of Ecclesiastical Policy would move sedition. Then was the Liturgy given to a number of moderate Divines, and Sir Thomas Smith a Statesman, to be purg'd and physick'd: And surely they were moderate Divines indeed, neither hot nor cold; and Grindal the best of them, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, lost favour in the court, and I think was discharged the government of his See, for favouring the Ministers, though Camden seem willing to find another cause: therefore about her second year, in a Parliament, of men and minds some scarce well grounded, others belching the four crudities of yesterday's Popery, those constitutions of EDWARD VI. which as you heard before, no way satisfied the men that made them, are now establish'd for best, and not to be mended. From that time follow'd nothing but imprisonments, troubles, disgraces on all those that found fault with the Decrees of the Convocation, and strait were they branded with the name of Puritans. As for the Queen herself, she was made believe that by putting down Bishops her Prerogative would be infring'd, of which shall be spoken anon as the course of method brings it in: And why the Prelates labour'd it should be so thought, ask not them, but ask their bellies. They had found a good tabernacle, they sate under a spreading vine, their lot was fallen in a fair inheritance. And these perhaps were the chief impeachments of a more sound rectifying the Church in the Queen's time.

From this period I count to begin our times, which because they concern us more nearly, and our own eyes and ears can give us the ampler scope to judge, will require a more exact search; and to effect this the speedier, I shall distinguish such as I esteem to be the hinderers of Reformation into three sorts, Antiquitarians, (for so I had rather call them than Antiquaries, whose labours are useful and laudable.) 2. Libertines. 3. Politicians.

To the votarists of Antiquity I shall think to have fully answer'd, if I shall be able to prove out of Antiquity, First, That if they will conform our Bishops to the purer times, they must mew their feathers, and their pounces, and make but curtail'd Bishops of them; and we know they hate to be dockt and clipt, as much as to be put down outright. Secondly, that those purer times were corrupt, and their books corrupted soon after. Thirdly, that the best of those that then wrote, disclaim that any man should repose on them, and send all to the Scriptures.

First therefore, if those that over-affect Antiquity will follow the square thereof, their Bishops must be elected by the hands of the whole Church. The ancientest of the extant Fathers, Ignatius, writing to the Philadelphians, saith, "that it belongs to them as to the Church of God to chuse a Bishop." Let no man cavil, but take the Church of God as meaning the whole consistence of Orders and Members, as St. Paul's epistles express, and this likewise being read over: Besides this, it is there to be mark'd, that those Philadelphians are exhorted to chuse a Bishop of Antioch. Whence it seems by the way that there was not that wary limitation of diocese in those times, which is confirm'd even by a fast friend of Episcopacy, Camden, who cannot but love Bishops as well as old Coins, and his much lamented Monasteries, for antiquity's sake. He writes in his description of Scotland, "That over all the world Bishops had no certain Diocese till Pope Dionysius about the year 268 did cut them out; and that the Bishops of Scotland executed their function in what place soever they came indifferently, and without distinction, till King Malcom the third, about the year 1070." Whence may be guess'd what their function was: Was it to go about circled with a band of rooking Officials, with cloak-bags full of citations, and proccesses to be serv'd by a corporality of griffon-like Promoters and Apparitors? Did he go about to pitch down his court, as an Empirick does his Bank, to inveigle in all the money of the country? No certainly it would not

not have been permitted him to exercise any such function indifferently wherever he came. And verily some such matter it was as want of a fat diocese that kept our Britain Bishops so poor in the primitive times, that being call'd to the council of Ariminum in the year 359, they had not wherewithal to defray the charges of their journey, but were fed and lodg'd upon the Emperor's cost; which must needs be no accidental, but usual poverty in them: for the Author Sulpitius Severus, in his 2d Book of Church-History praises them, and avouches it praise-worthy in a Bishop to be so poor as to have nothing of his own. But to return to the ancient election of Bishops, that it could not lawfully be without the consent of the people is so express in Cyprian, and so often to be met with, that to cite each place at large, were to translate a good part of the volume; therefore touching the chief passages, I refer the rest to whom so list peruse the Author himself: In the 24th Epist. "If a Bishop, saith he, be once made and allowed by the Testimony and Judgment of his Colleagues and the People, no other can be made." In the 55. "When a Bishop is made by the suffrage of all the People in peace. In the 68. mark but what he says; The People chiefly hath power either of chusing worthy ones, or refusing unworthy:" This he there proves by Authorities out of the old and new Testament, and with solid reasons: these were his antiquities.

This voice of the people, to be had ever in Episcopal elections, was so well known before Cyprian's time, even to those that were without the Church, that the Emperor Alexander Severus desir'd to have his Governors of provinces chosen in the same manner, as Lampridius can tell; so little thought it he offensive to Monarchy. And if single authorities persuade not, hearken what the whole general council of Nicæa, the first and famousst of all the rest, determines, writing a synodical Epistle to the African Churches, to warn them of Arianism; it exhorts them to chuse orthodox Bishops in the place of the dead, so they be worthy, and the people chuse them; whereby they seem to make the people's assent so necessary, that merit, without their free choice, were not sufficient to make a Bishop. What would ye say now, grave Fathers, if you should wake and see unworthy Bishops, or rather no Bishops, but Egyptian task-masters of ceremonies thrust purposely upon the groaning Church, to the affliction and vexation of God's people? It was not of old that a conspiracy of Bishops could frustrate and fob off the right of the people; for we may read how St. Martin, soon after Constantine, was made Bishop of Turon in France, by the people's consent from all places thereabout, maugre all the opposition that the Bishops could make. Thus went matters of the Church almost 400 years after Christ, and very probably far lower: for Nicephorus Phocas the Greek Emperor, whose reign fell near the 1000 year of our Lord, having done many things tyrannically, is said by Cedrenus to have done nothing more grievous and displeasing to the people, than to have enacted that no Bishop should be chosen without his will; so long did this right remain to the people in the midst of other palpable corruptions. Now for Episcopal dignity, what it was, see out of Ignatius, who in his epistle to those of Trallis, confesseth, "That the Presbyters are his fellow-counsellors and fellow-benchers." And Cyprian in many places, as in the 6, 41, 52. Epist. speaking of Presbyters, calls them his Compresbyters, as if he deem'd himself no other, whenas by the same place it appears he was a Bishop, he calls them Brethren; but that will be thought his meekness: yea, but the Presbyters and Deacons writing to him, think they do him honour enough when they phrase him no higher than Brother Cyprian, and dear Cyprian in the 26 Epist. For their authority 'tis evident not to have been single, but depending on the counsel of the Presbyters, as from Ignatius was erewhile alledg'd; and the same Cyprian acknowledges as much in the 6 Epist. and adds thereto, that he had determin'd, from his entrance into the Office of Bishop, to do nothing without the consent of his people, and so in the 31 Epist. for it were tedious to course through all his writings, which are so full of the like assertions, insomuch that even in the womb and center of Apostacy, Rome itself, there yet remains a glimpse of this truth; for the Pope himself,

himself, as a learned English writer notes well, performeth all Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction as in consistory among his Cardinals, which were originally but the Parish-priests of Rome. Thus then did the spirit of unity and meekness inspire and animate every joint and sinew of the mystical body; but now the gravest and worthiest Minister, a true Bishop of his fold, shall be revil'd and ruffled by an insulting and only canon-wise Prelate, as if he were some slight paltry companion: and the people of God, redeem'd and wash'd with Christ's blood, and dignify'd with so many glorious titles of Saints, and Sons in the Gospel, are now no better reputed than impure Ethnicks and lay-dogs; stones, and pillars, and crucifixes, have now the honour and the alms due to Christ's living members; the Table of Communion, now become a Table of Separation, stands like an exalted platform upon the brow of the Quire, fortify'd with bulwark and barricado, to keep off the profane touch of the Laicks, whilst the obscene and surfeited Priest scruples not to paw and mammock the Sacramental Bread, as familiarly as his tavern Bisket. And thus the people, vilify'd and rejected by them, give over the earnest study of virtue and godliness, as a thing of greater purity than they need, and the search of divine knowledge as a mystery too high for their capacities, and only for Church-men to meddle with; which is what the Prelates desire, that when they have brought us back to Popish blindness, we might commit to their dispose the whole managing of our Salvation, for they think it was never fair world with them since that time. But he that will mould a modern Bishop into a primitive, must yield him to be elected by the popular voice, undiocest, unrevenu'd, unlorded, and leave him nothing but brotherly equality, matchless temperance, frequent fasting, incessant prayer and preaching, continual watchings and labours in his Ministry; which what a rich booty it would be, what a plump endowment to the many-benefice-gaping-mouth of a Prelate, what a relish it would give to his canary-sucking, and swan-eating palate, let old Bishop Mountain judge for me.

How little therefore those ancient times make for modern Bishops, hath been plainly discours'd; but let them make for them as much as they will, yet why we ought not to stand to their arbitrement, shall now appear by a threefold corruption which will be found upon them. 1. The best times were spreadingly infected. 2. The best men of those times foully tainted. 3. The best writings of those men dangerously adulterated. These positions are to be made good out of those times witnessing of themselves. First, Ignatius in his early days testifies to the Churches of Asia, that even then heresies were sprung up, and rise every where, as Eusebius relates in his 3 Book, 35 chap. after the Greek number. And Hegesippus, a grave Church-writer of prime antiquity, affirms in the same Book of Eusebius, c. 32. "That while the Apostles were on earth, the depravers of Doctrine did but lurk; but they once gone, with open forehead they durst preach down the truth with falsities." Yea, those that are reckon'd for orthodox, began to make sad and shameful rents in the Church about the trivial celebration of feasts, not agreeing when to keep Easter-day; which controversy grew so hot, that Victor the Bishop of Rome excommunicated all the Churches of Asia for no other cause, and was worthily thereof reprov'd by Irenæus. For can any sound Theologer think that these great Fathers understood what was Gospel, or what was Excommunication? Doubtless that which led the good men into fraud and error was, that they attended more to the near tradition of what they heard the Apostles sometimes did, than to what they had left written, not considering that many things which they did were by the Apostles themselves profess'd to be done only for the present, and of mere indulgence to some scrupulous converts of the circumcision, but what they writ was of firm decree to all future ages. Look but a century lower in the 1 cap. of Eusebius 8 Book. What a universal tetter of Impurity had invenom'd every part, order, and degree of the Church, to omit the lay-herd, which will be little regarded, "those that seem to be our pastors, saith he, overturning the law of God's worship, burnt in contentions one towards another, and increasing in hatred and bitterness, outrageously sought to uphold lordship, and command

as it were a tyranny." Stay but a little, magnanimous Bishops, suppress your aspiring thoughts, for there is nothing wanting but Constantine to reign, and then tyranny herself shall give up all her citadels into your hands, and count ye thenceforward her trustiest agents. Such were these that must be called the ancientest and most virgin times between Christ and Constantine. Nor was this general contagion in their actions, and not in their writings: who is ignorant of the foul errors, the ridiculous wresting of Scripture, the Heresies, the Vanities thick sown through the volumes of Justin Martyr, Clemens, Origen, Tertullian, and others of eldest time? Who would think him fit to write an apology for Christian Faith to the Roman Senate, that would tell them "how of the Angels" which he must needs mean those in Genesis call'd the Sons of God, "mixing with women were begotten the devils," as good Justin Martyr in his Apology told them? But more indignation would it move to any Christian that shall read Tertullian, terming St. Paul a novice, and raw in grace, for reproving St. Peter at Antioch, worthy to be blam'd if we believe the Epistle to the Galatians: perhaps from this hint the blasphemous Jesuits presum'd in Italy to give their judgment of St. Paul, as of a hot-headed person, as Sandys in his relations tells us.

Now besides all this, who knows not how many superstitious works are ingrafted into the legitimate writings of the Fathers? And of those Books that pass for authentick, who knows what hath been tamper'd withal, what hath been raz'd out, what hath been inserted? Besides the late legerdemain of the Papists, that which Sulpitius writes concerning Origen's Books, gives us cause vehemently to suspect, there hath been packing of old. In the third chap. of his Dialogue we may read what wrangling the Bishops and Monks had about the reading or not reading of Origen, some objecting that he was corrupted by Hereticks, others answering that all such Books had been so dealt with. How then shall I trust these times to lead me, that testify so ill of leading themselves? Certainly of their defects their own witness may be best receiv'd, but of the rectitude and sincerity of their life and doctrine, to judge rightly, we must judge by that which was to be their rule.

But it will be objected, that this was an unsettled state of the Church, wanting the temporal magistrate to suppress the licence of false Brethren, and the extravagancy of still new opinions; a time not imitable for Church-government, where the temporal and spiritual power did not close in one belief, as under Constantine. I am not of opinion to think the Church a Vine in this respect, because, as they take it, she cannot subsist without clasping about the elm of worldly strength and felicity, as if the heavenly city could not support itself without the props and buttresses of secular authority. They extol Constantine because he extoll'd them; as our home-bred Monks in their histories blanch the kings their benefactors, and brand those that went about to be their correctors. If he had curb'd the growing pride, avarice, and luxury of the Clergy, then every page of his story should have swell'd with his faults, and that which Zozimus the Heathen writes of him should have come in to boot: we should have heard then in every declamation how he slew his nephew Commodus, a worthy man, his noble and eldest son Crispus, his wife Fausta, besides numbers of his friends; then his cruel-exactions, his unsoundness in Religion, favouring the Arians that had been condemned in a council, of which himself sat as it were president; his hard measure and banishment of the faithful and invincible Athanasius; his living unbaptiz'd almost to his dying day; these blurs are too apparent in his life. But since he must needs be the load-star of Reformation, as some men clatter, it will be good to see further his knowledge of Religion what it was, and by that we may likewise guess at the sincerity of his times in those that were not heretical, it being likely that he would converse with the famousst Prelates (for so he had made them, that were to be found for learning.

Of his Arianism we heard, and for the rest, a pretty scantling of his knowledge may be taken by his deferring to be baptiz'd so many years, a thing not usual, and repug-

nant to the tenor of Scripture; Philip knowing nothing that should hinder the Eunuch to be baptized after profession of his Belief. Next, by the excessive devotion, that I may not say superstition both of him and his mother Helena, to find out the cross on which Christ suffered, that had long lain under the rubbish of old ruins; (a thing which the disciples and kindred of our Saviour might with more ease have done, if they had thought it a pious duty :) some of the nails whereof he put into his helmet, to bear off blows in battle, others he fastened among the studs of his bridle, to fulfil (as he thought, or his court Bishops persuaded him) the prophecy of Zechariah; "And it shall be that which is in the bridle shall be holy to the Lord." Part of the cross, in which he thought such virtue to reside, as would prove a kind of Palladium to save the City wherever it remained, he caused to be laid up in a pillar of porphyry by his statue. How he or his teachers could trifle thus with half an eye open upon St. Paul's principles, I know not how to imagine.

How should then the dim taper of this emperor's age that had such need of snuffing, extend any beam to our times wherewith we might hope to be better lighted, than by those luminaries that God hath set up to shine to us far nearer hand. And what Reformation he wrought for his own Time, it will not be amiss to consider; he appointed certain times for fasts and feasts, built stately churches, gave large immunities to the clergy, great riches and promotions to Bishops, gave and minister'd occasion to bring in a deluge of ceremonies, thereby either to draw in the heathen by a resemblance of their rites, or to set a gloss upon the simplicity and plainness of Christianity; which to the gorgeous solemnities of Paganism, and the sense of the world's children, seemed but a homely and yeomanly Religion; for the beauty of inward sanctity was not within their prospect.

So that in this manner the Prelates, both then and ever since, coming from a mean and plebeian life on a sudden to be Lords of stately palaces, rich furniture, delicious fare, and princely attendance, thought the plain and home-spun verity of Christ's gospel unfit any longer to hold their lordship's acquaintance, unless the poor thread-bare matron were put into better clothes: her chaste and modest vail, surrounded with celestial beams, they overlaid with wanton Tresses, and in a flaring tire bespeckled her with all the gaudy allurements of a whore.

Thus flourish'd the Church with Constantine's wealth, and thereafter were the effects that followed; his son Constantius proved a flat Arian, and his nephew Julian an apostate, and there his race ended: the church that before by insensible degrees welk'd and impair'd, now with large steps went down hill decaying: at this time Antichrist began first to put forth his horn, and that saying was common, that former times had wooden chalices and golden priests; but they golden chalices and wooden priests. Formerly (saith Sulpitius,) "Martyrdom by glorious death was sought more greedily than now bishopricks by vile ambition are hunted after," (speaking of these times) and in another place, "they gape after possessions, they tend lands and livings, they cover over their gold, they buy and sell: and if there be any that neither possess nor traffique, that which is worse, they sit still, and expect gifts, and prostitute every indument of grace, every holy thing to sale." And in the end of his history thus he concludes, "all things went to wrack by the Faction, Wilfulness, and Avarice of the Bishops, and by this means God's people, and every good Man was had in scorn and derision;" which St. Martin found truly to be said by his friend Sulpitius; for being held in admiration of all men, he had only the Bishops his enemies, found God less favourable to him after he was Bishop than before, and for his last sixteen years would come at no Bishop's meeting. Thus you see, Sir, what Constantine's doings in the church brought forth, either in his own or in his son's reign.

Now lest it should be thought that something else might ail this author thus to hamper the bishops of those days; I will bring you the opinion of three the famousst men for wit and learning that Italy at this day glories of, whereby it may be concluded for a received opinion even among men professing the Romish faith, that Constantine marred all in the church.

church. Dante in his 19th Canto of Inferno hath thus, as I will render it you in English blank verse :

Ah Constantine ! of how much ill was cause
Not thy conversion, but those rich demains
That the first wealthy Pope receiv'd of thee ?

So in his 20th Canto of Paradise he makes the like complaint, and Petrarch seconds him in the same mind in his 108th sonnet, which is wip'd out by the Inquisitor in some editions ; speaking of the Roman Antichrist as merely bred up by Constantine.

Founded in chaste and humble poverty,
'Gainst them that rais'd thee dost thou lift thy horn,
Impudent whore, where hast thou plac'd thy hope ?
In thy adulterers, or thy ill-got wealth ?
Another Constantine comes not in haste.

Ariosto of Ferrara, after both these in time, but equal in fame, following the scope of his poem in a difficult knot how to restore Orlando his chief hero to his lost senses, brings Astolfo the English knight up into the moon, where St. John, as he feigns, met him. Cant. 34.

And to be short, at last his guide him brings
Into a goodly valley, where he sees
A mighty mass of things strangely confus'd,
Things that on earth were lost, or were abus'd.

And amongst these so abused things, listen what he met withal, under the conduct of the Evangelist.

Then past he to a flowry mountain green,
Which once smelt sweet, now stinks as odiously :
This was that gift (if you the truth will have)
That Constantine to good Sylvestro gave.

And this was a truth well known in England before this Poet was born, as our Chaucer's Plowman shall tell you by and by upon another occasion. By all these circumstances laid together, I do not see how it can be disputed what good this emperor Constantine wrought to the church, but rather whether ever any, though perhaps not wittingly, set open a door to more mischief in Christendom. There is just cause therefore that when the Prelates cry out, Let the Church be reformed according to Constantine, it should sound to a judicious ear no otherwise, than if they should say, Make us rich, make us lofty, make us lawless ; for if any under him were not so, thanks to those ancient remains of integrity, which were not yet quite worne out, and not to his government.

Thus finally it appears, that those purer times were not such as they are cry'd up, and not to be followed without suspicion, doubt and danger. The last point wherein the Antiquary is to be dealt with at his own weapon, is to make it manifest, that the ancientest and best of the Fathers have disclaimed all sufficiency in themselves that men should rely on, and sent all comers to the scriptures, as all-sufficient : that this is true, will not be unduly gathered, by shewing what esteem they had of antiquity themselves, and what validity they thought in it to prove doctrine, or discipline. I must of necessity begin from the second rank of fathers, because till then Antiquity could have no plea. Cyprian in his 63d Epistle : " If any," saith he, " of our ancestors, either ignorantly, or out of simplicity, hath not observed that which the Lord taught us by his example, (speaking of the Lord's supper) his simplicity God may pardon of his mercy ; but we cannot be excused

for following him, being instructed by the Lord." And have not we the same instructions; and will not this holy man, with all the whole consistory of saints and martyrs that lived of old, rise up and stop our mouths in judgment, when we shall go about to father our errors and opinions upon their authority? In the 73d Epist. he adds, "In vain do they oppose custom to us, if they be overcome by reason; as if custom were greater than truth, or that in spiritual things that were not to be followed, which is revealed for the better by the Holy Ghost." In the 74th, "Neither ought custom to hinder that truth should not prevail; for custom without truth is but agedness of error."

Next Lactantius, he that was preferred to have the bringing up of Constantine's children, in his second book of Institutions, chap. 7 and 8. disputes against the vain trust in antiquity, as being the chiefest argument of the heathen against the Christians: "They do not consider," saith he, "what religion is, but they are confident it is true, because the ancients delivered it; they count it a trespass to examine it." And in the eighth: "Not because they went before us in time, therefore in wisdom; which being given alike to all ages, cannot be prepossessed by the ancients: wherefore seeing that to seek the truth is inbred to all, they bereave themselves of wisdom, the gift of God, who without judgment follow the ancients, and are led by others like brute beasts." St. Austin writes to Fortunatian, that "he counts it lawful in the books of whomsoever, to reject that which he finds otherwise than true, and so he would have others deal by him." He neither accounted, as it seems, those fathers that went before, nor himself, nor others of his rank, for men of more than ordinary spirit, that might equally deceive, and be deceived: and oft-times setting our servile humours aside, yea, God so ordering, we may find truth with one man, as soon as in a council, as Cyprian agrees, 71 Epist. "Many things," saith he, "are better reveal'd to single persons." At Nicæa in the first, and best-reputed council of all the world, there had gone out a canon to divorce married priests, had not one old man Paphnutius stood up, and reasoned against it.

Now remains it to shew clearly that the Fathers refer all decision of controversy to the scriptures, as all-sufficient to direct, to resolve, and to determine. Ignatius taking his last leave of the Asian Churches, as he went to martyrdom, exhorted them to adhere close to the written doctrine of the Apostles, necessarily written for posterity: so far was he from unwritten traditions, as may be read in the 36 cap. of Eusebius 3 b. In the 74 Epist. of Cyprian against Stefan, Bishop of Rome, imposing upon him a tradition; Whence, quoth he, "is this tradition? Is it fetch'd from the authority of Christ in the gospel, or of the apostles in their epistles? for God testifies that those things are to be done which are written." And then thus, "What obstinacy, what presumption is this, to prefer human tradition before divine ordinance?" And in the same epist. If we shall return to the head, and beginning of divine tradition, (which we all know he means the Bible) human error ceases; and the reason of heavenly mysteries unfolded, whatsoever was obscure, becomes clear." And in the 14th distinct. of the same epist. directly against our modern fantasies of a still visible church, he teaches, "that succession of truth may fail; to renew which, we must have recourse to the fountains;" using this excellent similitude, "If a channel, or conduit-pipe which brought in water plentifully before, suddenly fail, do we not go to the fountain to know the cause, whether the spring affords no more, or whether the vein be stoppt, or turn'd aside in the mid-course? Thus ought we to do, keeping God's precepts, that if in ought the truth shall be chang'd, we may repair to the gospel, and to the apostles, that thence may arise the reason of our doings, from whence our order and beginning arose." In the 75 he inveighs bitterly against pope Stephanus, "for that he could boast his Succession from Peter, and yet foist in traditions that were not apostolical." And in his book of the unity of the church, he compares those that, neglecting God's word, follow the doctrines of men, to Corah, Dathan and Abiram. The very first page of Athanasius against the gentiles, avers the scriptures to be sufficient of them-

selves for the declaration of truth; and that if his friend Macarius read other religious writers, it was but *φιλονέως* come un virtuoso, (as the Italians say) as a lover of elegance: And in his second tome, the 39 pag. after he hath reckon'd up the canonical books, "In these only, saith he, is the doctrine of godliness taught; Let no man add to these, or take from these." And in his Synopsis, having again set down all the writers of the old and new testament, "These, saith he, be the anchors and props of our faith." Besides these, millions of other books have been written by great and wise men according to rule, and agreement with these, of which I will not now speak, as being of infinite number, and mere dependance on the canonical books. Basil in his 2d Tome, writing of true faith, tells his auditors, he is bound to teach them that which he hath learnt out of the bible: And in the same treatise he saith, "That seeing the commandments of the Lord are faithful, and sure for ever; it is a plain falling from the faith, and a high pride, either to make void any thing therein, or to introduce any thing not there to be found:" And he gives the reason, "for Christ saith, my sheep hear my voice, they will not follow another, but fly from him, because they know not his voice." But not to be endless in quotations, it may chance to be objected, that there be many opinions in the fathers which have no ground in scripture; so much the less, may I say, should we follow them, for their own words shall condemn them, and acquit us that lean not on them; otherwise these their words will acquit them, and condemn us. But it will be reply'd, the scriptures are difficult to be understood, and therefore require the explanation of the Fathers. 'Tis true, there be some books, and especially some places in those books, that remain clouded; yet ever that which is most necessary to be known, is most easy; and that which is most difficult, so far expounds itself ever, as to tell us how little it imports our saving Knowledge. Hence to infer a general obscurity over all the text, is a mere suggestion of the devil to dissuade men from reading it, and casts an aspersion of dishonour both upon the Mercy, Truth, and Wisdom of God. We count it no gentleness, or fair dealing in a man of power amongst us, to require strict and punctual obedience, and yet give out all his commands ambiguous and obscure, we should think he had a plot upon us; certainly such commands were no commands, but snares. The very essence of truth is plainness and brightness, the darkness and crookedness is our own. The Wisdom of God created Understanding, fit and proportionable to truth, the object and end of it, as the eye to the thing visible. If our understanding have a film of ignorance over it, or be blear with gazing on other false glisterings; what is that to truth? If we will but purge with sovereign eye-salve that intellectual ray which God hath planted in us, then we would believe the scriptures protesting their own plainness and perspicuity, calling to them to be instructed, not only the Wise and Learned, but the Simple, the Poor, the Babes, foretelling an extraordinary effusion of God's Spirit upon every age, and sex, attributing to all men, and requiring from them the ability of searching, trying, examining all things, and by the spirit discerning that which is good; and as the scriptures themselves pronounce their own plainness, so do the Fathers testify of them.

I will not run into a paroxysm of citations again in this point, only instance Athanasius in his fore-mentioned first page; "The knowledge of truth, saith he, wants no human Lore, as being evident in itself, and by the preaching of Christ now opens brighter than the Sun." If these doctors, who had scarce half the light that we enjoy; who all, except two or three, were ignorant of the Hebrew tongue, and many of the Greek, blundering upon the dangerous and suspectful translations of the apostate Aquila, the heretical Theodotion, the judaiz'd Symmachus, the erroneous Origen; if these could yet find the bible so easy; why should we doubt, that have all the helps of learning, and faithful industry that man in this life can look for, and the assistance of God as near now to us as ever? But let the scriptures be hard; are they more hard, more crabbed, more

more abstruse than the fathers? He that cannot understand the sober, plain and unaffected stile of the scriptures, will be ten times more puzzled with the knotty Africanisms, the pamper'd metaphors, the intricate and involv'd sentences of the Fathers, besides the fantastick and declamatory flashes, the cross-jingling periods which cannot but disturb, and come thwart a settled devotion, worse than the din of bells and rattles.

Now, Sir, for the love of holy Reformation, what can be said more against these importunate clients of antiquity, than she herself their patroness hath said? Whether think ye would she approve still to doat upon immeasurable, innumerable, and therefore unnecessary and unmerciful volumes, chusing rather to err with the specious name of the Fathers, or to take a sound truth at the hand of a plain upright man, that all his days hath been diligently reading the holy scriptures, and thereto imploring God's grace, while the admirers of antiquity have been beating their brains about their Ambones, their Dyparchs, and Meniaia's? Now, he that cannot tell of stations and indictions, nor has wasted his precious hours in the endless conferring of councils and conclaves that demolish one another, (although I know many of those that pretend to be great rabbies in these studies, have scarce saluted them from the strings, and the title-page; or to give them more, have been but the ferrets and mouse-hunts of an Index :) yet what pastor or minister, how learned, religious, or discreet soever, does not now bring both his cheeks full blown with œcumenical and synodical, shall be counted a lank, shallow, insufficient man, yea a dunce, and not worthy to speak about Reformation of Church-Discipline. But I trust they for whom God hath reserv'd the honour of reforming this church, will easily perceive their adversaries drift in thus calling for antiquity: they fear the plain field of the scriptures; the chase is too hot; they seek the dark, the bushy, the tangled forest, they would imbosc: they feel themselves strook in the transparent streams of divine truth, they would plunge, and tumble, and think to lie hid in the foul weeds and muddy waters, where no plummet can reach the bottom. But let them beat themselves like whales, and spend their oil till they be drag'd ashore: though wherefore should the ministers give them so much line for shifts and delays? Wherefore should they not urge only the gospel, and hold it ever in their faces like a mirror of diamond, till it dazle and pierce their misty eye-balls? maintaining it the honour of its absolute sufficiency and supremacy inviolable: for if the scripture be for Reformation, and Antiquity to boot, 'tis but an advantage to the dozen, 'tis no winning cast: And though antiquity be against it, while the scriptures be for it, the cause is as good as ought to be wish'd, Antiquity itself sitting judge.

But to draw to an end; the second sort of those that may be justly number'd among the hinderers of Reformation, are libertines; these suggest that the discipline sought would be intolerable: for one bishop now in a diocese, we should then have a pope in every parish. It will not be requisite to answer these men, but only to discover them; for reason they have none, but lust and licentiousness, and therefore answer can have none. It is not any discipline that they could live under, it is the corruption and remissness of discipline that they seek. Episcopacy duly executed, yea, the Turkish and Jewish rigour against whoring and drinking; the dear and tender discipline of a father, the sociable and loving reproof of a brother, the bosom admonition of a friend, is a Presbytery, and a consistory to them. 'Tis only the merry friar in Chaucer can * disple them.

Full sweetly heard he confession,
And pleasant was his absolution,
He was an easy man to give penance.

And so I leave them; and refer the political discourse of episcopacy to a Second Book.

O F

* A contraction of disciple.

OF
REFORMATION
IN
ENGLAND.

The SECOND BOOK.

SIR,

IT is a work good and prudent to be able to guide one man; of larger extended virtue to order well one house: but to govern a nation piously and justly, which only is to say happily, is for a spirit of the greatest size, and divinest mettle. And certainly of no less a mind, nor of less excellence in another way, were they who by writing laid the solid and true foundations of this science, which being of greatest importance to the life of man, yet there is no art that hath been more canker'd in her principles, more soil'd, and slubber'd with aphorisming pedantry, than the art of policy; and that most, where a man would think should least be, in christian commonwealths. They teach not, that to govern well, is to train up a nation in true wisdom and vertue, and that which springs from thence, magnanimity, (take heed of that) and that which is our beginning, regeneration, and happiest end, likeness to God, which in one word we call Godliness; and that this is the true flourishing of a land, other things follow as the shadow does the substance; to teach thus were mere pulpitory to them. This is the masterpiece of a modern politician, how to qualify and mould the sufferance and subjection of the people to the length of that foot that is to tread on their necks; how rapine may serve itself with the fair and honourable pretences of publick good; how the puny law may be brought under the wardship and controul of lust and will: in which attempt if they fall short, then must a superficial colour of reputation by all means, direct or indirect, be gotten to wash over the unsightly bruise of honour. To make men governable in this manner, their precepts mainly tend to break a national spirit and courage, by countenancing open riot, luxury, and ignorance, till having thus disfigur'd and made men beneath men, as Juno in the fable of Io, they deliver up the poor transform'd heifer of the commonwealth to be stung and vexed with the breefe and goad of oppression, under the custody of some Argus with a hundred eyes of jealousy. To be plainer, Sir, how to fodder, how to stop a leak, how to keep up the floating carcase of a crazy and diseased monarchy or state, betwixt wind and water, swimming still upon her own dead lees, that now is the deep design of a politician. Alas! Sir, a commonwealth ought to be but as one huge christian personage, one mighty growth and stature of an honest man, as big and compact in virtue as in body; for look what the grounds and causes are of single happiness to one man, the same ye shall find them to a whole state,

as Aristotle both in his ethics, and politics, from the principles of reason lays down : by consequence therefore that which is good and agreeable to monarchy, will appear soonest to be so, by being good and agreeable to the true welfare of every christian ; and that which can be justly proved hurtful and offensive to every true christian, will be evinc'd to be alike hurtful to monarchy : for God forbid that we should separate and distinguish the end and good of a monarch, from the end and good of the monarchy, or of that, from christianity. How then this third and last sort that hinder reformation, will justify that it stands not with reason of state, I much muse : For certain I am, the Bible is shut against them, as certain that neither Plato nor Aristotle is for their turns. What they can bring us now from the schools of Loyola with his jesuits, or their Malvezzi, that can cut Tacitus into slivers and steaks, we shall presently hear. They alledge, 1. That the Church-government must be conformable to the civil polity ; next, that no form of Church-government is agreeable to monarchy, but that of bishops. Must Church-government that is appointed in the gospel, and has chief respect to the soul, be conformable and pliant to civil, that is arbitrary, and chiefly conversant about the visible and external part of man ? This is the very maxim that moulded the calves of Bethel and of Dan ; this was the quintessence of Jeroboam's policy, he made religion conform to his politick interests ; and this was the sin that watch'd over the Israelites till their final captivity. If this State-principle come from the prelates, as they affect to be counted statists, let them look back to Elutherius bishop of Rome, and see what he thought of the policy of England ; being required by Lucius, the first christian king of this Island, to give his counsel for the founding of religious laws, little thought he of this sage caution, but bids him betake himself to the Old and New-Testament, and receive direction from them how to administer both Church and Commonwealth ; that he was God's vicar, and therefore to rule by God's laws ; that the edicts of Cæsar we may at all times disallow, but the statutes of God for no reason we may reject. Now certain, if Church-government be taught in the gospel, as the bishops dare not deny, we may well conclude of what late standing this position is, newly calculated for the altitude of Bishop-elevation, and lettuce for their lips. But by what example can they shew, that the form of Church-discipline must be minted and modell'd out to secular pretences ? The ancient republick of the Jews is evident to have run through all the changes of civil estate, if we survey the story from the giving of the law to the Herods ; yet did one manner of priestly government serve without inconvenience to all these temporal mutations ; it serv'd the mild aristocracy of elective dukes, and heads of tribes join'd with them ; the dictatorship of the judges, the easy or hard-handed monarchies, the domestick or foreign tyrannies : Lastly, the Roman senate from without, the Jewish senate at home, with the Galilean tetrarch ; yet the Levites had some right to deal in civil affairs : but seeing the evangelical precept forbids Churchmen to intermeddle with worldly employments, what interweavings, or interworkings can knit the Minister and the Magistrate in their several functions, to the regard of any precise correspondency ? Seeing that the Churchman's Office is only to teach men the christian faith, to exhort all, to encourage the good, to admonish the bad, privately the less offender, publickly the scandalous and stubborn ; to censure and separate from the communion of Christ's flock, the contagious and incorrigible, to receive with joy and fatherly compassion the penitent : all this must be done, and more than this, is beyond any Church-Authority. What is all this either here or there, to the temporal regiment of Weal-publick, whether it be popular, princely, or monarchical ? Where doth it intrench upon the temporal governor ? Where does it come in his walk ? Where doth it make inroad upon his jurisdiction ? Indeed if the Minister's part be rightly discharg'd, it renders him the people more conscionable, quiet, and easy to be govern'd ; if otherwise, his life and doctrine will declare him. If therefore the constitution of the Church be already set down by divine Prescript, as all sides confess, then can she not be a hand-maid to wait on civil commodities, and respects : and
if

if the nature and limits of Church-Discipline be such, as are either helpful to all political estates indifferently, or have no particular relation to any, then is there no necessity, nor indeed possibility of linking the one with the other in a special conformation.

Now for their second conclusion, "That no form of Church-Government, is agreeable to monarchy, but that of Bishops," although it fall to pieces of itself by that which hath been said; yet to give them play, front and rear, it shall be my task to prove that episcopacy, with that authority which it challenges in England, is not only not agreeable, but tending to the destruction of monarchy. While the primitive pastors of the Church of God labour'd faithfully in their ministry, tending only their sheep, and not seeking, but avoiding all worldly matters as clogs, and indeed derogations and debasements to their high calling; little needed the princes and potentates of the earth, which way soever the gospel was spread, to study ways how to make a coherence between the church's polity, and theirs: therefore when Pilate heard once our Saviour Christ professing that "his Kingdom was not of this World," he thought the Man could not stand much in Cæsar's light, nor much indamage the Roman empire; for if the life of Christ be hid to this world, much more is his scepter unoperative, but in spiritual things. And thus lived for two or three ages, the successors of the apostles. But when through Constantine's lavish superstition they forsook their first love, and set themselves up two gods instead, Mammon and their Belly; then taking advantage of the spiritual power which they had on men's consciences, they began to cast a longing eye to get the body also, and bodily things into their command: upon which their carnal desires, the spirit daily quenching and dying in them, knew no way to keep themselves up from falling to nothing, but by bolstering and supporting their inward rottenness, by a carnal and outward strength. For a while they rather privily sought opportunity, than hastily disclosed their project; but when Constantine was dead, and three or four emperors more, their drift became notorious and offensive to the whole world; for while Theodosius the younger reign'd, thus writes Socrates the Historian, in his 7th Book Chap. 11. "Now began an ill name to stick upon the Bishops of Rome and Alexandria, who beyond their priestly bounds now long ago had stept into principality:" and this was scarce 80 years since their raising from the meanest worldly condition. Of courtesy now let any man tell me, if they draw to themselves a temporal strength and power out of Cæsar's Dominion, is not Cæsar's empire thereby diminished? But this was a stolen bit, hitherto he was but a caterpillar secretly gnawing at monarchy; the next time you shall see him a wolf, a lion, lifting his paw against his raiser, as Petrarch express'd it, and finally an open enemy and subverter of the Greek empire. Philippicus and Leo, with divers other emperors after them, not without the advice of their Patriarchs, and at length of a whole Eastern Council of three hundred thirty eight Bishops, threw the images out of Churches as being decreed idolatrous.

Upon this goodly occasion, the Bishop of Rome not only seizes the city, and all the territory about into his own hands, and makes himself Lord thereof, which till then was govern'd by a Greek magistrate, but absolves all Italy of their tribute and obedience due to the emperor, because he obey'd God's Commandment in abolishing idolatry.

Mark, Sir, here how the pope came by St. Peter's patrimony, as he feigns it; not the donation of Constantine, but idolatry and rebellion got it him. Ye need but read Sigonius, one of his own sect, to know the story at large. And now to shroud himself against a storm from the Greek Continent, and provide a champion to bear him out in these practices, he takes upon him by papal sentence to unthrone Chilpericus the rightful king of France, and gives the kingdom to Pepin for no other cause, but that he seem'd to him the more active man. If he were a friend herein to Monarchy, I know not; but to the Monarch I need not ask what he was.

Having thus made Pepin his fast friend, he calls him into Italy against Aistulphus the Lombard, that warr'd upon him for his late usurpation of Rome, as belonging to Ravenna which he had newly won. Pepin, not unobedient to the pope's call, passing into Italy, frees him out of danger, and wins for him the whole exarchate of Ravenna; which though it had been almost immediately before the hereditary possession of that Monarchy, which was his chief patron and benefactor, yet he takes and keeps it to himself as lawful prize, and given to St. Peter. What a dangerous fallacy is this, when a spiritual man may snatch to himself any temporal dignity or dominion, under pretence of receiving it for the Church's use? Thus he claims Naples, Sicily, England, and what not? To be short, under shew of his zeal against the errors of the Greek Church, he never ceas'd baiting and goring the successors of his best lord Constantine, what by his barking curses and excommunications, what by his hindring the western princes from aiding them against the Sarazens and Turks, unless when they humour'd him; so that it may be truly affirm'd, he was the subversion and fall of that Monarchy, which was the hoisting of him. This, besides Petrarch, whom I have cited, our Chaucer also hath observ'd, and gives from hence a caution to England, to beware of her Bishops in time, for that their ends and aims are no more friendly to Monarchy, than the popes.

This he begins in the Plow-man speaking, Part 2. Stanz. 28.

The Emperor yafe the pope sometime
So high lordship him about,
That at last the filly kime,
The proud pope put him out;
So of this realm is no doubt,
But lords beware and them defend;
For now these folks be wonders stout,
The king and lords now this amend.

And in the next Stanza, which begins the third part of the tale, he argues that they ought not to be lords.

Moses law forbode it tho-
That priests should no lordship welde,
Christ's gospel biddeth also
That they should no lordships held:
Ne Christs Apostles were never so bold
No such lordships to hem embrace,
But smeren her sheep and keep her fold.

And so forward. Whether the Bishops of England have deserv'd thus to be fear'd by men so wise as our Chaucer is esteem'd; and how agreeable to our Monarchy and Monarchs, their demeanour has been, he that is but meanly read in our Chronicles needs not be instructed. Have they not been as the Canaanites, and Philistines, to this kingdom? what treasons, what revolts to the pope? what rebellions, and those the basest and most pretenceless, have they not been chief in? What could Monarchy think, when Becket durst challenge the custody of Rochester-Castle, and the Tower of London, as appertaining to his signory? To omit his other insolencies and affronts to regal majesty, 'till the lashes inflicted on the anointed body of the king, wash'd off the holy unction with his blood drawn by the polluted hands of Bishops, Abbots, and Monks.

What good upholders of royalty were the Bishops, when by their rebellious opposition against king John, Normandy was lost, he himself depos'd, and this kingdom made

made over to the pope? When the Bishop of Winchester durst tell the nobles, the pillars of the realm, that there were no peers in England, as in France, but that the king might do what he pleas'd. What could tyranny say more? It wou'd be pretty now, if I shou'd insist upon the rendring up of Tournay by Woolsey's treason, the excommunications, cursings, and interdicts upon the whole land: For haply I shall be cut off short by a reply, that these were the faults of men and their popish errors, not of Episcopacy, that hath now renounc'd the pope, and is a protestant. Yes sure; as wise and famous men have suspected and fear'd the protestant Episcopacy in England, as those that have fear'd the papal.

You know, Sir, what was the judgment of Padre Paolo, the great Venetian antagonist of the pope, for it is extant in the hands of many men, whereby he declares his fear, that when the hierarchy of England shall light into the hands of busy and audacious men, or shall meet with princes tractable to the Prelacy, then much mischief is like to ensue. And can it be nearer hand, than when Bishops shall openly affirm that, no Bishop, no King? A trim paradox, and that ye may know where they have been a begging for it, I will fetch you the twin-brother to it out of the jesuits cell: they feeling the axe of God's reformation, hewing at the old and hollow trunk of papacy, and finding the Spaniard their surest friend, and safest refuge, to sooth him up in his dream of a fifth monarchy, and withal to uphold the decrepit papalty, have invented this super-politick aphorism, as one terms it, one pope, and one king.

Surely there is not any prince in Christendom, who hearing this rare sophistry, can chuse but smile; and if we be not blind at home, we may as well perceive that this worthy motto, no Bishop, no King, is of the same batch, and infanted out of the same fears, a meer ague-cake coagulated of a certain fever they have, presaging their time to be but short: and now like those that are sinking, they catch round of that which is likeliest to hold them up; and would persuade regal power, that if they dive, he must after. But what greater debasement can there be to royal dignity, whose tow'ring and steadfast height rests upon the unmoveable foundations of justice, and heroick virtue, than to chain it in a dependance of subsisting, or ruining, to the painted battlements and gaudy rottenness of prelacy, which want but one puff of the king's to blow them down like a past-board house built of Court-Cards? Sir, the little ado which methinks I find in untacking these pleasant sophisms, puts me into the mood to tell you a tale e'er I proceed further; and Menenius Agrippa speed us.

Upon a time the body summoned all the members to meet in the guild for the common good, (as Æsop's chronicles aver many stranger accidents:) the head by right takes the first seat, and next to it a huge and monstrous wen little less than the head itself, growing to it by a narrower excrescency. The members, amazed, began to ask one another what he was that took place next their chief? none could resolve. Whereat the wen, tho' unwieldy, with much ado gets up, and bespeaks the assembly to this purpose: that as in place he was second to the head, so by due of merit; that he was to it an ornament, and strength, and of special near relation; and that if the head should fail, none were fitter than himself to step into his place: therefore he thought it for the honour of the body, that such dignities and rich endowments should be decreed him, as did adorn, and set out the noblest members. To this was answered, that it should be consulted. Then was a wise and learned philosopher sent for, that knew all the charters, laws and tenures of the body. On him it is imposed by all, as chief committee to examine, and discuss the claim and petition of right put in by the wen; who soon perceiving the matter, and wondering at the boldness of such a swollen tumor, Wilt thou (quoth he) that art but a bottle of vicious and hardened excrements, contend with the lawful and free-born members, whose certain number is set by ancient, and unrepealable statute? head thou art none, though thou receive this huge substance from it: what office bearest thou? what good canst thou shew by thee done to the commonweal? The wen not easily dasht replies, that his office

was his glory; for so oft as the soul would retire out of the head from over the steaming vapours of the lower parts to divine contemplation, with him she found the purest and quietest retreat, as being most remote from soil and disturbance. Lourdau, quoth the philosopher, thy folly is as great as thy filth: know that all the faculties of the soul are confined of old to their several vessels and ventricles, from which they cannot part without dissolution of the whole body; and that thou containest no good thing in thee, but a heap of hard and loathsome uncleanness, and art to the head a foul disfigurement and burden, when I have cut thee off, and opened thee, as by the help of these implements I will do, all men shall see.

But to return whence was digress'd: seeing that the throne of a king, as the wise king Solomon often remembers us, "is established in justice," which is the universal Justice that Aristotle so much praises, containing in it all other Virtues, it may assure us that the fall of prelacy, whose actions are so far distant from Justice, cannot shake the least fringe that borders the royal canopy; but that their standing doth continually oppose and lay battery to regal safety, shall by that which follows easily appear. Amongst many secondary and accessory causes that support monarchy, these are not of least reckoning, though common to all other states: the love of the subjects, the multitude and valour of the people, and store of treasure. In all these things hath the kingdom been of late sore weakened, and chiefly by the prelates. First, let any man consider, that if any prince shall suffer under him a commission of authority to be exercised, 'till all the land groan and cry out, as against a whip of scorpions, whether this be not likely to lessen, and keel the affections of the subject. Next, what numbers of faithful and free-born Englishmen, and good Christians, have been constrained to forsake their dearest home, their friends and kindred, whom nothing but the wide ocean, and the savage deserts of America could hide and shelter from the fury of the bishops? O Sir, if we could but see the shape of our dear mother England, as poets are wont to give a personal form to what they please, how would she appear, think ye, but in a mourning weed, with ashes upon her head, and tears abundantly flowing from her eyes, to behold so many of her children exposed at once, and thrust from things of dearest necessity, because their conscience could not assent to things which the bishops thought indifferent? What more binding than conscience? what more free than indifferency? cruel then must that indifferency needs be, that shall violate the strict necessity of conscience; merciless and inhuman that free choice and liberty that shall break asunder the bonds of religion! Let the astrologer be dismayed at the portentous blaze of comets, and impressions in the air, as foretelling troubles and changes to states: I shall believe there cannot be a more ill-boding sign to a nation (God turn the omen from us!) than when the inhabitants, to avoid insufferable grievances at home, are enforced by heaps to forsake their native country. Now, whereas the only remedy and amends against the depopulation and thinness of a land within, is the borrowed strength of firm alliance from without, these priestly policies of theirs having thus exhausted our domestick forces, have gone the way also to leave us as naked of our firmest and faithfulest neighbours, abroad, by disparaging and alienating from us all protestant princes, and commonwealths; who are not ignorant that our prelates, and as many as they can infect, account them no better than a sort of sacrilegious and puritanical rebels, preferring the Spaniard our deadly enemy before them, and set all orthodox writers at nought in comparison of the jesuits, who are indeed the only corrupters of youth and good learning: and I have heard many wise and learned men in Italy say as much. It cannot be that the strongest knot of confederacy should not daily slacken, when religion, which is the chief engagement of our league, shall be turn'd to their reproach. Hence it is that the prosperous and prudent States of the United Provinces, (whom we ought to love, if not for themselves, yet for our own good work in them, they having been in a manner planted and erected by us, and having been since to us the faithful watchmen and discoverers of many a popish and Austrian plotted treason, and with us the partners of many a bloody and victorious battel,) whom

whom the similitude of manners and language, the commodity of traffick, which founded the old Burgundian league betwixt us, but chiefly religion, should bind to us immortally; even such friends as these, out of some principles instilled into us by the prelates, have been often dismiss'd with distastful answers, and sometimes unfriendly actions: nor is it to be considered to the breach of confederate nations, whose mutual interest is of such high consequence, though their merchants bicker in the East-Indies; neither is it safe, or wary, or indeed christianly, that the French king, of a different faith, should afford our nearest allies as good protection as we. Sir, I persuade myself, if our zeal to true religion, and the brotherly usage of our truest friends, were as notorious to the world, as our Prelatical Schism, and captivity to Rotchet Apothegms, we had e'er this seen our old conquerors, and afterwards liegemen the Normans, together with the Britains our proper colony, and all the Gascoins that are the rightful Dowry of our ancient kings, come with cap and knee, desiring the shadow of the English sceptre to defend them from the hot persecutions and taxes of the French. But when they come hither, and see a tympany of Spaniolized Bishops swaggering in the fore-top of the state, and meddling to turn and dandle the Royal Ball with unskilful and Pedantic Palms, no marvel though they think it as unsafe to commit religion and liberty to their arbitrating as to a synagogue of jesuits.

But what do I stand reckoning upon advantages and gains lost by the misrule and turbulence of the Prelates? what do I pick up so thriftily their scatterings and diminishings of the meaner subject, whilst they by their seditious practices have endangered to lose the king one third of his main stock? What have they not done to banish him from his own native country? But to speak of this as it ought, would ask a volume by itself.

Thus as they have unpeopled the kingdom by expulsion of so many thousands, as they have endeavoured to lay the skirts of it bare by disheartening and dishonouring our loyallest confederates abroad, so have they hamstrung the valour of the subject by seeking to effeminate us all at home. Well knows every wise nation that their liberty consists in manly and honest labours, in sobriety and rigorous honour to the marriage-bed, which in both sexes should be bred up from chaste hopes to loyal enjoyments; and when the people slacken, and fall to looseness and riot, then do they as much as if they laid down their necks for some wild tyrant to get up and ride. Thus learnt Cyrus to tame the Lydians, whom by arms he could not whilst they kept themselves from luxury; with one easy proclamation to set up Stews, dancing, feasting, and dicing, he made them soon his slaves. I know not what drift the Prelates had, whose brokers they were to prepare, and supple us either for a foreign invasion or domestick oppression; but this I am sure, they took the ready way to despoil us both of Manhood and Grace at once, and that in the shamefullest and ungodliest manner, upon that day which God's law, and even our own reason hath consecrated, that we might have one day at least of seven set apart wherein to examine and encrease our knowledge of God, to meditate, and commune of our faith, our hope, our eternal city in heaven, and to quicken withal the study and exercise of charity; at such a time that men should be plucked from their soberest and saddest thoughts, and by Bishops, the pretended Fathers of the Church, instigated, by publick edict, and with earnest endeavour pushed forward to gaming, jigging, wassailing, and mixt dancing, is a horror to think! Thus did the reprobate hireling priest Balaam seek to subdue the Israelites to Moab, if not by force, then by this devilish Policy, to draw them from the sanctuary of God to the luxurious and ribald feasts of Baal-peor. Thus have they trespassed not only against the Monarchy of England, but of heaven also, as others, I doubt not, can prosecute against them.

I proceed within my own bounds to shew you next what good agents they are about the revenues and riches of the kingdom, which declares of what moment they are to Monarchy, or what avail. Two leeches they have that still suck, and suck the kingdom, their ceremonies and their courts. If any man will contend that ceremonies be lawful under the gospel, he may be answered other where. This doubtless, that they ought to be many

and

and over-costly, no true Protestant will affirm. Now I appeal to all wise men, what an excessive waste of treasure hath been within these few years in this land, not in the expedient, but in the idolatrous erection of temples beautified exquisitely to outvie the Papists, the costly and dear-bought scandals and snares of images, pictures, rich copes, gorgeous altar-cloths: and by the courses they took, and the opinions they held, it was not likely any stay would be, or any end of their madness, where a pious pretext is so ready at hand to cover their insatiate desires. What can we suppose this will come to? what other materials than these have built up the spiritual Babel to the height of her abominations? Believe it, Sir, right truly it may be said, that Antichrist is Mammon's son. The four leaven of human traditions, mixt in one putrified mass with the poisonous dregs of hypocrisy in the hearts of Prelates, that lie basking in the sunny warmth of wealth and promotion, is the serpent's egg that will hatch an Antichrist wheresoever, and engender the same monster as big, or little, as the lump is which breeds him. If the Splendor of Gold and Silver begin to lord it once again in the church of England, we shall see Antichrist shortly wallow here, though his chief kennel be at Rome. If they had one thought upon God's Glory, and the advancement of Christian faith, they would be a means that with these expences, thus profusely thrown away in trash, rather Churches and Schools might be built, where they cry out for want, and more added where too few are; a moderate maintenance distributed to every painful minister, that now scarce sustains his family with bread, while the Prelates revel like Belshazzar with their full carouses in Goblets, and Vessels of Gold snatched from God's Temple: which (I hope) the worthy men of our land will consider. Now then for their Courts. What a mass of money is drawn from the veins into the ulcers of the kingdom this way; their extortions, their open corruptions, the multitude of hungry and ravenous harpies that swarm about their offices declare sufficiently. And what though all this go not over sea? 'twere better it did: better a penurious kingdom, than where excessive wealth flows into the graceless and injurious hands of common sponges, to the impoverishing of good and loyal men, and that by such execrable, such irreligious courses.

If the sacred and dreadful works of holy Discipline, Censure, Penance, Excommunication, and Absolution, where no prophane thing ought to have access, nothing to be assistant but sage and christianly Admonition, brotherly Love, flaming Charity and Zeal; and then according to the effects, paternal Sorrow, or paternal Joy, mild Severity, melting compassion; if such divine Ministeries as these, wherein the angel of the Church represents the person of Christ Jesus, must lie prostitute to sordid fees, and not pass to and fro between our Saviour that of free grace redeemed us, and the submissive penitent without the truccage of perishing coin, and the butcherly execution of tormentors, rooks and rakeshames sold to lucre, then have the Babylonish merchants of Souls just excuse. Hitherto, Sir, you have heard how the Prelates have weakened and withdrawn the external accomplishments of kingly prosperity, the love of the people, their multitude, their valour, their wealth; mining and sapping the outworks and redoubts of Monarchy. Now hear how they strike at the very heart and vitals.

We know that Monarchy is made up of two parts, the liberty of the subject, and the supremacy of the king. I begin at the root. See what gentle and benign fathers they have been to our liberty! Their trade being by the same alchymy that the Pope uses, to extract heaps of Gold and Silver out of the droffy Bullion of the people's sins; and justly fearing that the quick-sighted Protestant's eye, cleared in great part from the mist of superstition, may at one time or other look with a good judgment into these their deceitful pedleries; to gain as many associates of guiltiness as they can, and to infect the temporal magistrate with the like lawless, tho' not sacrilegious extortion, see a while what they do; they ingage themselves to preach, and persuade an assertion for truth the most false, and to this Monarchy the most pernicious and destructive that could be chosen. What more baneful to Monarchy than a popular commotion, for the dissolution of Monarchy slides
aptest

aptest into a Democracy; and what stirs the Englishmen, as our wisest writers have observed, sooner to rebellion, than violent and heavy hands upon their goods and purses? Yet these devout Prelates, spight of our great charter, and the souls of our progenitors that wrested their liberties out of the Norman gripe with their dearest blood and highest prowess, for these many years have not ceased in their pulpits wrinching and spraining the Text, to set at nought and trample under foot all the most sacred and life-blood laws, statutes, and acts of Parliament, that are the holy covenant of union and marriage between the king and his realm, by proscribing and confiscating from us all the right we have to our own bodies, goods and liberties. What is this but to blow a trumpet, and proclaim a fire-cross to a hereditary and perpetual civil war? Thus much against the subjects liberty hath been assaulted by them. Now how they have spared supremacy, or are likely hereafter to submit to it, remains lastly to be considered.

The emulation that under the old Law was in the king towards the Priest, is now so come about in the Gospel, that all the danger is to be fear'd from the Priest to the king. Whilst the Priest's office in the Law was set out with an exterior lustre of pomp and glory, kings were ambitious to be Priests; now Priests not perceiving the heavenly brightness and inward splendor of their more glorious Evangelick Ministry, with as great ambition affect to be kings, as in all their courses is easy to be observ'd. Their eyes ever imminent upon worldly matters, their desires ever thirsting after worldly employments; instead of diligent and fervent study in the Bible, they covet to be expert in canons and decretals, which may inable them to judge and interpose in temporal causes, however pretended Ecclesiastical. Do they not hord up Pelf, seek to be potent in secular Strength, in State Affairs, in Lands, Lordships, and Demeans, to sway and carry all before them in High Courts and Privy Councils, to bring into their grasp the high and principal Offices of the kingdom? Have they not been bold of late to check the Common Law, to slight and brave the indiminishable majesty of our highest Court, the Law-giving and sacred Parliament? Do they not plainly labour to exempt Churchmen from the Magistrate? Yea, so presumptuously as to question and menace Officers that represent the King's Person for using their authority against drunken Priests? The cause of protecting murderous Clergymen was the first heart-burning that swell'd up the audacious Becket to the pestilent and odious vexation of Henry the Second. Nay more, have not some of their devoted scholars begun, I need not say to nibble, but openly to argue against the king's Supremacy? Is not the chief of them accus'd out of his own Book, and his late Canons, to affect a certain unquestionable Patriarchate, independent and un subordinate to the Crown? From whence having first brought us to a servile Estate of Religion and Manhood, and having predispos'd his conditions with the Pope, that lays claim to this Land, or some Pepin of his own creating, it were all as likely for him to aspire to the Monarchy among us, as that the Pope could find means so on the sudden both to bereave the Emperor of the Roman Territory with the favour of Italy, and by an unexpected friend out of France, while he was in danger to lose his new-got Purchase, beyond hope to leap into the fair Exarchate of Ravenna.

A good while the Pope fittly acted the Lamb, writing to the Emperor, "my Lord Tiberius, my lord Mauritius;" but no sooner did this his Lord pluck at the Images and Idols, but he threw off his Sheep's cloathing, and started up a Wolf, laying his paws upon the Emperor's Right, as forfeited to Peter. Why may not we as well, having been forewarn'd at home by our renowned Chaucer, and from abroad by the great and learned Padre Paolo, from the like beginnings, as we see they are, fear the like events? Certainly a wise and provident King ought to suspect a Hierarchy in his realm, being ever attended, as it is, with two such greedy purveyors, ambition and usurpation; I say, he ought to suspect a Hierarchy to be as dangerous and derogatory from his crown as a Tetrarchy or a Heptarchy. Yet now that the Prelates had almost attain'd to what their insolent and unbridl'd minds had hurried them; to thrust the Laity under the despotical rule

rule of the Monarch, that they themselves might confine the Monarch to a kind of pillage under their Hierarchy, observe but how their own principles combat one another, and supplant each one his fellow.

Having fitted us only for peace, and that a servile peace, by lessening our numbers, draining our estates, enfeebling our bodies, cowing our free spirits by those ways as you have heard, their impotent actions cannot sustain themselves the least moment, unless they would rouse us up to a war fit for Cain to be the leader of; an abhorred, a cursed, a fraternal war. ENGLAND and SCOTLAND, dearest Brothers both in Nature and in CHRIST, must be set to wade in one another's blood; and IRELAND our free Denizen upon the back of us both, as occasion should serve: a piece of service that the Pope and all his Factors have been compassing to do ever since the Reformation.

But ever-blessed be he, and ever glorify'd, that from his high watch-tower in the Heavens, discerning the crooked ways of perverse and cruel men, hath hitherto maim'd and infatuated all their damnable inventions, and deluded their great Wizards with a delusion fit for Fools and Children: had God been so minded, he could have sent a Spirit of Mutiny amongst us, as he did between Abimelech and the Sechemites, to have made our funerals, and slain heaps more in number than the miserable surviving remnant; but he, when we least deserv'd, sent out a gentle gale and message of peace from the wings of those his Cherubims that fan his Mercy-seat. Nor shall the wisdom, the moderation, the Christian piety, the constancy of our Nobility and Commons of England be ever forgotten, whose calm and temperate connivance could sit still and smile out the stormy bluster of men more audacious and precipitant than of solid and deep reach, 'till their own fury had run itself out of breath, assailing by rash and heady approaches the impregnable situation of our liberty and safety, that laught such weak enginery to scorn, such poor drifts to make a National War of a Surplice Brable, a Tippet-suffle, and ingage the untainted Honour of English Knighthood to unfurl the streaming Red Cross, or to rear the horrid Standard of those fatal guly Dragons for so unworthy a purpose, as to force upon their fellow-subjects that which themselves are weary of, the Skeleton of a Mass-Book. Nor must the patience, the fortitude, the firm obedience of the Nobles and People of Scotland, striving against manifold provocations; nor must their sincere and moderate proceedings hitherto be unremember'd, to the shameful conviction of all their detractors.

Go on both hand in hand, O NATIONS, never to be disunited; be the praise and the heroick Song of all POSTERITY; merit this, but seek only vertue, not to extend your limits; (for what needs to win a fading triumphant laurel out of the tears of wretched men?) but to settle the pure Worship of God in his Church, and Justice in the state: then shall the hardest difficulties smooth out themselves before ye; Envy shall sink to Hell, Craft and Malice be confounded, whether it be homebred mischief or outlandish cunning: yea, other nations will then covet to serve ye, for Lordship and Victory are but the pages of Justice and Vertue. Commit securely to true wisdom the vanquishing and uncasing of craft and subtlety, which are but her two runnagates: join your invincible might to do worthy and godlike deeds; and then he that seeks to break your union, a cleaving curse be his inheritance to all Generations.

Sir, you have now at length this question for the time, and as my memory would best serve me in such a copious and vast theme, fully handled, and you yourself may judge whether Prelacy be the only Church-government agreeable to MONARCHY. Seeing therefore the perillous and confused estate into which we are fallen, and that to the certain knowledge of all men, through the irreligious pride and hateful tyranny of Prelates, (as the innumerable and grievous complaints of every shire cry out) if we will now resolve to settle affairs either according to pure Religion or sound Policy, we must first of all begin roundly to cashier and cut away from the public body the noisom and diseased humour of Prelacy, and come from Schism to Unity with our neighbour reform'd Sister-Churches,

Churches, which with the blessing of peace and pure doctrine have now long time flourish'd; and doubtless with all hearty joy and gratulation will meet and welcome our Christian Union with them, as they have been all this while griev'd at our strangeness, and little better than separation from them. And for the discipline propounded, seeing that it hath been inevitably prov'd that the natural and fundamental causes of political happiness in all governments are the same, and that this Church-discipline is taught in the Word of God, and, as we see, agrees according to wish with all such states as have receiv'd it; we may infallibly assure ourselves that it will as well agree with Monarchy, though all the tribe of Aphorismers and Politicasters would persuade us there be secret and mysterious reasons against it. For upon the settling hereof mark what nourishing and cordial restorments to the state will follow, the Ministers of the Gospel attending only to the work of salvation, every one within his limited charge; besides the diffusive blessings of God upon all our actions, the king shall sit without an old disturber, a daily incroacher and intruder; shall rid his kingdom of a strong sequester'd and collateral Power; a confronting Miter, whose potent wealth and wakeful ambition he had just cause to hold in jealousy: not to repeat the other present evils which only their removal will remove, and because things simply pure are inconsistent in the mass of nature, nor are the elements or humours in a man's body exactly homogeneous; and hence the best-founded commonwealths and least barbarous have aimed at a certain mixture and temperament, partaking the several virtues of each other state, that each part drawing to it self may keep up a steady and even uprightness in common.

There is no civil government that hath been known, no not the Spartan, not the Roman, though both for this respect so much prais'd by the wise Polybius, more divinely and harmoniously tun'd, more equally ballanc'd as it were by the hand and scale of justice, than is the commonwealth of England; where, under a free and untutor'd Monarch, the noblest, worthiest, and most prudent men, with full approbation and suffrage of the people, have in their power the supreme and final determination of highest affairs. Now if conformity of Church-discipline to the civil be so desir'd, there can be nothing more parallel, more uniform, than when under the sovereign Prince, Christ's viceroy, using the Scepter of David, according to God's Law, the godliest, the wisest, the learnedest Ministers in their several charges have the instructing and disciplining of God's People, by whose full and free election they are consecrated to that holy and equal Aristocracy. And why should not the piety and conscience of Englishmen, as members of the Church, be trusted in the election of Pastors to Functions that nothing concern a Monarch, as well as their worldly wisdoms are privileg'd as members of the state in suffraging their Knights and Burgeses to matters that concern him nearly? And if in weighing these several Offices, their difference in time and quality be cast in, I know they will not turn the beam of equal judgment the moiety of a scruple. We therefore having already a kind of apostolical and ancient Church-election in our state, what a perverseness would it be in us of all others to retain forcibly a kind of imperious and stately election in our Church? And what a blindness to think that what is already evangelical, as it were by a happy chance in our polity, should be repugnant to that which is the same by divine command in the Ministry? Thus then we see that our ecclesial and political choices may consent and sort as well together without any rupture in the STATE, as Christians and Freeholders. But as for honour, that ought indeed to be different and distinct, as either office looks a several way; the Minister whose calling and end is spiritual, ought to be honour'd as a father and physician to the soul, (if he be found to be so) with a son-like and disciple-like reverence, which is indeed the dearest and most affectionate honour, most to be desired by a wise man, and such as will easily command a free and plentiful provision of outward necessities, without his further care of this world.

The Magistrate, whose charge is to see to our persons and estates, is to be honour'd with a more elaborate and personal courtship, with large salaries and stipends, that he himself may abound in those things whereof his legal justice and watchful care gives us the quiet enjoyment. And this distinction of honour will bring forth a seemly and graceful uniformity over all the kingdom.

Then shall the Nobles possess all the dignities and offices of temporal honour to themselves, sole Lords without the improper mixture of scholastic and pusillanimous upstarts; the Parliament shall void her Upper House of the same annoyances; the common and civil Laws shall be both set free, the former from the controul, the other from the mere vassalage and copy-hold of the Clergy.

And whereas temporal Laws rather punish men when they have transgress'd, than form them to be such as should transgress seldomest, we may conceive great hopes, through the showers of Divine Benediction watering the unmolested and watchful pains of the Ministry, that the whole inheritance of God will grow up so straight and blameless, that the civil magistrate may with far less toil and difficulty, and far more ease and delight, steer the tall and goodly vessel of the commonwealth through all the gusts and tides of the world's mutability.

Here I might have ended, but that some objections, which I have heard commonly flying about, press me to the endeavour of an answer. We must not run, they say, into sudden extremes. This is a fallacious rule, unless understood only of the actions of vertue about things indifferent: for if it be found that those two extremes be vice and vertue, falsehood and truth, the greater extremity of vertue and superlative truth we run into, the more vertuous and the more wise we become; and he that flying from degenerate and traditional corruption, fears to shoot himself too far into the meeting embraces of a divinely warranted reformation, had better not have run at all. And for the suddenness, it cannot be fear'd. Who should oppose it? The Papists? they dare not. The Protestants otherwise affected? they were mad. There is nothing will be remov'd but what to them is professedly indifferent. The long affection which the people have borne to it, what for itself, what for the odiousness of Prelates, is evident: From the first year of Queen ELIZABETH it hath still been more and more propounded, desir'd, and beseech'd, yea sometimes favourably forwarded by the Parliaments themselves. Yet if it were sudden and swift, provided still it be from worse to better, certainly we ought to hie us from evil like a torrent, and rid ourselves of corrupt discipline, as we would shake fire out of our bosoms.

Speedy and vehement were the Reformations of all the good kings of Juda, though the people had been nuzzl'd in idolatry ever so long before; they fear'd not the bug-bear danger, nor the lion in the way that the sluggish and timorous politician thinks he sees; no more did our Brethren of the Reform'd Churches abroad, they ventur'd, (God being their guide) out of rigid Popery, into that which we in mockery call precise Puritanism, and yet we see no inconvenience beset them.

Let us not dally with God when he offers us a full blessing, to take as much of it as we think will serve our ends, and turn him back the rest upon his hands, lest in his anger he snatch all from us again. Next, they alledge the antiquity of Episcopacy through all ages. What it was in the Apostle's time, that questionless it must be still; and therein I trust the Ministers will be able to satisfy the Parliament. But if Episcopacy be taken for Prelacy, all the ages they can deduce it through, will make it no more venerable than Papacy.

Most certain it is (as all our stories bear witness) that ever since their coming to the See of Canterbury for near twelve hundred years, to speak of them in general, they have been in England to our souls a sad and doleful succession of illiterate and blind guides; to our purses and goods a wastful band of robbers, a perpetual havock and rapine; to our state a continual Hydra of mischief and molestation, the forge of discord and rebellion:

bellion: This is the trophy of their antiquity, and boasted succession through so many ages. And for those Prelate-Martyrs they glory of, they are to be judg'd what they were by the Gospel, and not the Gospel to be tried by them.

And it is to be noted, that if they were for bishopricks and ceremonies, it was in their prosperity and fulness of bread; but in their persecution, which purify'd them, and near their death, which was their garland, they plainly disliked and condemn'd the ceremonies, and threw away those Episcopal ornaments wherein they were install'd as foolish and detestable; for so the words of Ridley at his degradation, and his letter to Hooper, expressly shew. Neither doth the author of our Church-History spare to record sadly the fall (for so he terms it) and infirmities of these Martyrs, though we would deify them. And why should their martyrdom more countenance corrupt doctrine or discipline, than their subscriptions justify their treason to the Royal Blood of this realm, by diverting and intailing the right of the crown from the true heirs, to the houses of Northumberland and Suffolk? which had it took effect, this present king had in all likelihood never sat on this throne, and the happy union of this island had been frustrated.

Lastly, whereas they add that some the learnedest of the Reformed abroad admire our Episcopacy; it had been more for the strength of the argument to tell us, that some of the wisest statesmen admire it, for thereby we might guess them weary of the present discipline, as offensive to their state, which is the bug we fear: but being they are Churchmen, we may rather suspect them for some Prelatizing Spirits that admire our bishopricks, not Episcopacy.

The next objection vanishes of itself, propounding a doubt, whether a greater inconvenience would not grow from the corruption of any other discipline than from that of Episcopacy. This seems an unseasonable foresight, and out of order, to defer and put off the most needful constitution of one right discipline, while we stand ballancing the commodities of two corrupt ones. First constitute that which is right, and of itself it will discover and rectify that which swerves, and easily remedy the pretended fear of having a Pope in every parish, unless we call the zealous and meek censure of the Church a Popedom, which whoso does, let him advise how he can reject the pastorly rod and sheep-hook of Christ, and those cords of love, and not fear to fall under the iron scepter of his anger, that will dash him to pieces like a potsherd.

At another doubt of theirs I wonder, whether this discipline which we desire be such as can be put in practice within this kingdom; they say it cannot stand with the common law nor with the king's safety, the government of Episcopacy is now so weav'd into the common law. In God's name let it weave out again; let not human quillets keep back divine authority. 'Tis not the common law, nor the civil, but piety and justice that are our foundresses; they stoop not, neither change colour for Aristocracy, Democracy, or Monarchy, nor yet at all interrupt their just courses; but far above the taking notice of these inferior niceties, with perfect sympathy, wherever they meet, kiss each other. Lastly, they are fearful that the discipline which will succeed cannot stand with the king's safety. Wherefore? it is but Episcopacy reduc'd to what it should be: were it not that the tyranny of Prelates under the name of Bishops had made our ears tender, and startling, we might call every good Minister a Bishop, as every Bishop, yea the Apostles themselves are call'd Ministers, and the Angels ministering Spirits, and the Ministers again Angels. But wherein is this propounded government so shrewd? Because the government of assemblies will succeed. Did not the Apostles govern the Church by assemblies? How should it else be Catholick? How should it have communion? We count it sacrilege to take from the rich Prelates their lands and revenues, which is sacrilege in them to keep, using them as they do; and can we think it safe to defraud the living Church of God of that right which God has given her in assemblies? O but the consequence! assemblies draw to them the supremacy of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. No surely, they draw no supremacy, but that authority which Christ, and St. Paul in

his name, confers upon them. The king may still retain the same supremacy in the assemblies, as in the Parliament; here he can do nothing alone against the common Law, and there neither alone, nor with consent, against the Scriptures. But is this all? No, this ecclesiastical supremacy draws to it the power to excommunicate kings; and then follows the worst that can be imagined. Do they hope to avoid this, by keeping Prelates that have so often done it? Not to exemplify the malapert insolence of our own Bishops in this kind towards our kings, I shall turn back to the primitive and pure times, which the objectors would have the rule of reformation to us.

Not an assembly, but one Bishop alone, Saint Ambrose of Milan, held Theodosius the most Christian Emperor under excommunication above eight months together, drove him from the Church in the presence of his Nobles; which the good Emperor bore with heroic humility, and never ceas'd by prayers and tears, till he was absolv'd; for which coming to the Bishop with Supplication into the Salutatory, some out-porch of the Church, he was charged by him of tyrannical madness against God, for coming into holy ground. At last, upon conditions absolved, and after great humiliation approaching to the altar to offer, (as those thrice pure times then thought meet) he had scarce withdrawn his hand, and stood a while, when a bold Archdeacon comes in the Bishop's name, and chaces him from within the rails, telling him peremptorily, that the place wherein he stood, was for none but the Priests to enter, or to touch; and this is another piece of pure Primitive Divinity! Think ye then our Bishops will forego the power of excommunication on whomsoever? No certainly, unless to compass sinister ends, and then revoke when they see their time. And yet this most mild, though withal dreadful and inviolable prerogative of Christ's diadem, excommunication, serves for nothing with them, but to prog and pander for fees, or to display their pride, and sharpen their revenge, debarring men the protection of the Law; and I remember not whether in some cases it bereave not men all right to their worldly goods and inheritances, besides the denial of Christian burial. But in the evangelical, and reformed use of this sacred censure, no such Prostitution, no such Iscariotical drifts are to be doubted, as that spiritual doom and sentence should invade worldly possession, which is the rightful lot and portion even of the wickedest men, as frankly bestow'd upon them by the all-dispensing bounty as rain and sunshine. No, no, it seeks not to bereave or destroy the body; it seeks to save the soul by humbling the body, not by imprisonment, or pecuniary mulct, much less by stripes or bonds, or disinherittance, but by fatherly admonishment and christian rebuke, to cast it into godly sorrow, whose end is joy, and ingenuous bashfulness to sin: If that cannot be wrought, then as a tender mother takes her child and holds it over the pit with scaring words, that it may learn to fear where danger is; so doth excommunication as dearly and as freely, without money, use her wholesome and saving terrors: she is instant, she beseeches, by all the dear and sweet promises of Salvation she entices and woos; by all the threatnings and thunders of the Law, and rejected Gospel, she charges, and adjures: this is all her armory, her munition, her artillery; then she awaits with long-sufferance, and yet ardent zeal. In brief, there is no act in all the errand of God's Ministers to mankind, wherein passes more lover-like contestation between Christ and the soul of a regenerate man lapsing, than before, and in, and after the sentence of excommunication. As for the fogging proctorage of money, with such an eye as strook Gehazi with leprosy, and Simon Magus with a curse; so does she look, and so threaten her fiery whip against that banking den of thieves that dare thus baffle, and buy and sell the awful and majestic wrinkles of her brow. He that is rightly and apostolically sped with her invisible arrow, if he can be at peace in his soul, and not smell within him the brimstone of hell, may have fair leave to tell all his bags over undiminish'd of the least farthing, may eat his dainties, drink his wine, use his delights, enjoy his lands and liberties, not the least skin rais'd, not the least hair misplac'd, for all that excommunication has done: Much more may a king enjoy his rights and

prero-

prerogatives undeflour'd, untouch'd, and be as absolute and compleat a king, as all his royalties and revenues can make him. And therefore little did Theodosius fear a plot upon his empire, when he stood excommunicate by St. Ambrose, though it were done either with much haughty pride, or ignorant zeal. But let us rather look upon the reformed Churches beyond the seas, the Grizons, the Swisses, the Hollanders, the French, that have a supremacy to live under as well as we; where do the Churches in all these places strive for supremacy? Where do they clash and juggle supremacies with the civil Magistrate? In France, a more severe monarchy than ours, the Protestants under this Church-government, carry the name of the best subjects the king has; and yet Presbytery, if it must be so called, does there all that it desires to do: How easy were it, if there be such great suspicion, to give no more scope to it in England? But let us not, for fear of a scare-crow, or else through hatred to be reform'd, stand hankering and politizing, when God with spread hands testifies to us, and points us out the way to our peace.

Let us not be so over-credulous, unless God hath blinded us, as to trust our dear souls into the hands of men that beg so devoutly for the pride and gluttony of their own backs and bellies, that sue and solicit so eagerly, not for the saving of souls, the consideration of which can have here no place at all, but for their bishopricks, deaneries, prebends, and chanonies: how can these men not be corrupt, whose very cause is the bribe of their own pleading, whose mouths cannot open without the strong breath and loud stench of avarice, simony, and sacrilege, embezzling the treasury of the church on painted and gilded walls of temples, wherein God hath testified to have no delight, warming their palace kitchens, and from thence their unctuous and Epicurean paunches, with the alms of the blind, the lame, the impotent, the aged, the orphan, the widow? for with these the treasury of Christ ought to be, here must be his jewels bestowed, his rich cabinet must be emptied here; as the constant martyr Saint Laurence taught the Roman Prætor. Sir, would you know what the remonstrance of these men would have, what their petition implies? They intreat us that we would not be weary of those insupportable grievances that our shoulders have hitherto cracked under, they beseech us that we would think 'em fit to be our justices of peace, our lords, our highest officers of state, though they come furnished with no more experience than they learnt between the Cook and the Manciple, or more profoundly at the college Audit, or the Regent House, or to come to their deepest insight, at their Patron's Table; they would request us to endure still the rustling of their silken cassocks, and that we would burst our Midriffs, rather than laugh to see them under sail in all their lawn and farcenet, their shrouds and tackle, with a Geometrical Rhomboides upon their heads: they would bear us in hand that we must of duty still appear before them once a year in Jerusalem, like good circumcised Males and Females, to be taxed by the poll, to be scons'd our head-money, our two-pences in their chaunlery shop-book of Easter. They pray us that it would please us to let them still hale us, and worry us with their ban-dogs and purse-vants; and that it would please the Parliament that they may yet have the whipping, fleecing, and fleaing of us in their diabolical courts, to tear the flesh from our bones, and into our wide wounds instead of balm, to pour in the oil of tartar, vitriol, and mercury: surely a right reasonable, innocent, and soft-hearted petition. O the relenting bowels of the fathers! Can this be granted them, unless God have smitten us with frenzy from above, and with a dazzling giddiness at noon-day? Should not those men rather be heard that come to plead against their own preferments, their worldly advantages, their own abundance; for honour and obedience to God's Word, the conversion of souls, the Christian Peace of the land, and Union of the reformed Catholick Church, the unappropriating and unmonopolizing the rewards of Learning and Industry, from the greasy clutch of ignorance, and high feeding. We have try'd already, and miserably felt what ambition, worldly Glory and immoderate Wealth can do, what the boisterous and contradictory hand of a temporal, earthly, and corporeal spirituality can avail to the edifying of Christ's

Christ's holy Church; were it such a desperate hazard to put to the venture the universal votes of Christ's congregation, the fellowly and friendly yoke of a teaching and laborious ministry, the pastorlike and apostolick imitation of meek and unlordly discipline, the gentle and benevolent mediocrity of church-maintenance, without the ignoble hucksterage of piddling Tithes? Were it such an incurable mischief to make a little trial, what all this would do to the flourishing and growing up of Christ's mystical body? as rather to use every poor shift, and if that serve not, to threaten uproar and combustion, and shake the brand of civil discord?

O, Sir, I do now feel myself inwrapt on the sudden into those mazes and Labyrinths of dreadful and hideous thoughts, that which way to get out, or which way to end, I know not, unless I turn mine eyes, and with your help lift up my hands to that eternal and propitious Throne, where nothing is readier than Grace and Refuge to the distresses of mortal suppliants: and it were a shame to leave these serious thoughts less piously than the heathen were wont to conclude their graver discourses.

Thou therefore that fittest in light and glory unapproachable, Parent of Angels and Men! next thee I implore omnipotent King, Redeemer of that lost remnant whose nature thou didst assume, ineffable and everlasting Love! And thou the third subsistence of divine infinitude, illuminating Spirit, the joy and solace of created Things! one Tri-personal Godhead! look upon this thy poor and almost spent and expiring Church, leave her not thus a prey to these importunate Wolves, that wait and think long till they devour thy tender Flock; these wild Boars that have broke into thy Vineyard, and left the print of their polluting hoofs on the souls of thy servants. O let them not bring about their damned designs, that stand now at the entrance of the bottomless pit, expecting the watchword to open and let out those dreadful Locusts and Scorpions, to re-involve us in that pitchy Cloud of infernal darkness, where we shall never more see the Sun of thy Truth again, never hope for the chearful Dawn, never more hear the Bird of Morning sing. Be moved with pity at the afflicted state of this our shaken Monarchy, that now lies labouring under her throws, and struggling against the grudges of more dreaded calamities.

O thou that after the impetuous rage of five bloody inundations, and the succeeding sword of intestine War, soaking the land in her own gore, didst pity the sad and ceaseless revolution of our swift and thick-coming sorrows; when we were quite breathless, of thy free Grace didst motion Peace, and terms of covenant with us; and having first well-nigh freed us from Antichristian thralldom, didst build up this Britannick Empire to a glorious and enviable height, with all her daughter-islands about her; stay us in this felicity, let not the obstinacy of our half-obedience and will-worship bring forth that Viper of Sedition, that for these fourscore years hath been breeding to eat through the entrails of our Peace; but let her cast her abortive spawn without the danger of this travelling and throbbing Kingdom. That we may still remember in our solemn Thanksgivings, how for us, the Northern Ocean even to the frozen Thule, was scattered with the proud shipwrecks of the Spanish Armado, and the very maw of hell ranfack'd, and made to give up her concealed destruction, 'ere she could vent it in that horrible and damned blast.

O how much more glorious will those former deliverances appear, when we shall know them not only to have saved us from greatest miseries past, but to have reserved us for greatest happiness to come? Hitherto thou hast but freed us, and that not fully, from the unjust and tyrannous claim of thy foes, now unite us entirely, and appropriate us to thyself, tie us everlastingly in willing homage to the Prerogative of thy eternal Throne.

And now we know, O thou our most certain hope and defence, that thine enemies have been consulting all the forceries of the great Whore, and have joined their plots with that sad intelligencing tyrant that mischiefs the world with his mines of Ophir, and lies thirsting to revenge his naval ruins that have larded our seas: but let them all take counsel together, and let it come to nought; let them decree, and do thou cancel it; let them gather
then

ther themselves, and be scattered; let them imbattel themselves, and be broken; let them imbattel, and be broken, for thou art with us.

Then amidst the Hymns and Hallelujahs of Saints, some one may perhaps be heard offering at high Strains in new and lofty Measures, to sing and celebrate thy divine Mercies, and marvellous Judgments in this land throughout all Ages; whereby this great and warlike nation, instructed and inured to the fervent and continual practice of Truth and Righteousness, and casting far from her the Rags of her old Vices, may press on hard to that high and happy emulation to be found the soberest, wisest, and most Christian People at that day, when thou the eternal and shortly-expected King, shalt open the clouds to judge the several kingdoms of the world, and distributing National Honours and Rewards to religious and just Commonwealths, shall put an end to all earthly Tyrannies, proclaiming thy universal and mild Monarchy through heaven and earth. Where they undoubtedly, that by their Labours, Counsels, and Prayers, have been earnest for the common Good of Religion and their Country, shall receive above the inferior Orders of the Blessed, the regal addition of Principalities, Legions, and Thrones into their glorious Titles, and in super-eminence of beatific Vision, progressing the dateless and irrevoluble circle of Eternity, shall clasp inseparable hands with Joy and Bliss, in over-measure for ever.

But they contrary, that by the impairing and diminution of the true Faith, the distresses and servitude of their Country, aspire to high Dignity, Rule and Promotion here, after a shameful end in this Life, (which God grant them) shall be thrown down eternally into the darkest and deepest Gulf of Hell, where under the despiteful Controul, the trample and spurn of all the other Damned, that in the anguish of their torture, shall have no other ease than to exercise a raving and bestial Tyranny over them as their Slaves and Negroes, they shall remain in that plight for ever, the basest, the lowermost, the most dejected, most underfoot, and down-trodden Vassals of Perdition.

OF
PRELATICAL EPISCOPACY,

And whether it may be deduced from the Apostolical Times, by virtue of those testimonies which are alledg'd to that purpose in some late treatises; one whereof goes under the name of James Archbishop of Armagh.

EPISCOPACY, as it is taken for an order in the Church above a Presbyter, or as we commonly name him, the minister of a congregation, is either of divine constitution, or of human. If only of human, we have the same human privilege that all men have ever had since Adam, being born free, and in the mistress island of all the British, to retain this Episcopacy, or to remove it, consulting with our own occasions and conveniences, and for the prevention of our own dangers and disquiets, in what best manner we can devise, without running at a loss, as we must needs in those stale and useless records of either uncertain or unsound antiquity; which, if we hold fast to the grounds of the reformed Church, can neither skill of us, nor we of it, so oft as it would lead us to the broken reed of Tradition. If it be of Divine constitution, to satisfy us fully in that, the scripture only is able, it being the only book left us of Divine authority, not in any thing more divine than in the all-sufficiency it hath to furnish us, as with all other spiritual knowledge, so with this in particular, setting out to us a perfect man of God, accomplish'd to all the good works of his charge: through all which book can be no where, either by plain text, or solid reasoning, found any difference between a bishop and a Presbyter, save that they be two names to signify the same order. Notwithstanding this clearness, and that by all evidence of argument, Timothy and Titus (whom our prelates claim to imitate only in the controuling part of their office) had rather the vicegerency of an apostleship committed to them, than the ordinary charge of a bishoprick, as being men of an extraordinary calling; yet to verify that which St. Paul foretold of succeeding times, when men began to have itching ears, then not contented with the plentiful and wholesome fountains of the gospel, they began after their own lusts to heap to themselves teachers, and as if the divine scripture wanted a supplement, and were to be eke'd out, they cannot think any doubt resolved, and any doctrine confirmed, unless they run to that indigested heap and fry of authors, which they call antiquity. Whatsoever time, or the heedless hand of blind chance, hath drawn down from of old to this present, in her huge drag-net, whether fish or sea-weed, shells, or shrubs, unpick'd, unchosen, those are the fathers. Seeing therefore some men, deeply conversant in books, have had so little care of late to give the world a better account of their reading, than by divulging needless tractates, stuffed with specious names of Ignatius and Polycarpus; with fragments of old Martyrologies, and Legends, to distract and stagger the multitude of credulous readers, and mislead them from their strong guards and places of safety, under the tuition of holy writ; it came into my thoughts to persuade myself, setting all distances, and nice respects aside, that I could do religion, and my country no better service for the time, than doing my utmost endeavour to recall the people of God from this vain foraging after straw, and to reduce them to their firm stations under the standard of the gospel; by making appear to them, first the insufficiency, next the inconveniency; and lastly, the impiety of
of

of these gay testimonies, that their great doctors would bring them to dote on. And in performing this, I shall not strive to be more exact in method, than as their citations lead me.

First, therefore concerning Ignatius shall be treated fully, when the author shall come to insist upon some places in his epistles. Next, to prove a succession of 27 Bishops from Timothy, he cites one Leontius Bishop of Magnesia, out of the 11th Act of the Chalcedonian Council: this is but an obscure and single witness, and for his faithful dealing who shall commend him to us, with this his catalogue of Bishops? What know we further of him, but that he might be as factious and false a Bishop, as Leontius of Antioch, that was a hundred years his predecessor? For neither the praise of his wisdom, or his virtue, hath left him memorable to posterity, but only this doubtful relation, which we must take at his word: and how shall this testimony receive credit from his word, whose very name had scarce been thought on but for this bare testimony? But they will say, he was a member of the council, and that may deserve to gain him credit with us. I will not stand to argue, as yet with fair allowance I might, that we may as justly suspect there were some bad and slippery men in that council, as we know there are wont to be in our convocations: nor shall I need to plead at this time, that nothing hath been more attempted, nor with more subtlety brought about, both anciently by other Hereticks, and modernly by Papists, than to falsify the editions of the councils, of which we have none but from our adversaries hands, whence canons, acts, and whole spurious councils are thrust upon us; and hard it would be to prove in all, which are legitimate against the lawful rejection of an urgent and free disputer. But this I purpose not to take advantage of; for what avails it to wrangle about the corrupt editions of councils, whenas we know that many years ere this time, which was almost 500 years after Christ, the councils themselves were foully corrupted with ungodly prelatism, and so far plung'd into worldly ambition, as that it stood them upon long ere this to uphold their now well-tasted hierarchy by what fair pretext soever they could, in like manner as they had now learnt to defend many other gross corruptions by as ancient, and supposed authentick tradition as episcopacy? And what hope can we have of this whole council to warrant us a matter, 400 years at least above their time, concerning the distinction of Bishop and Presbyter, whenas we find them such blind judges of things before their eyes, in their decrees of precedency between Bishop and Bishop, acknowledging Rome for the apostolick throne, and Peter in that see for the rock, the basis, and the foundation of the catholick church and faith, contrary to the interpretation of more ancient fathers? And therefore from a mistaken text did they give to Leo, as Peter's successor, a kind of preheminance above the whole council, as Euagrius expresses (for now the pope was come to that height, as to arrogate to himself by his vicars incompetible honours) and yet having thus yielded to Rome the universal primacy for spiritual reasons, as they thought, they conclude their sitting with a carnal and ambitious decree, to give the second place of dignity to Constantinople from reason of state, because it was New ROME; and by like consequence doubtless of earthly privileges annex to each other city, was the BISHOP thereof to take his place.

I may say again therefore, what hope can we have of such a council, as beginning in the spirit, ended thus in the flesh? Much rather should we attend to what Eusebius, the ancientest writer extant of Church-History, notwithstanding all the helps he had above these, confesses in the 4th chapter of his 3d Book, That it was no easy matter to tell who were those that were left Bishops of the Churches by the apostles, more than by what a man might gather from the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of St. Paul, in which number he reckons Timothy for Bishop of Ephesus. So as may plainly appear, that this tradition of Bishoping Timothy over Ephesus, was but taken for granted out of that place in St. Paul, which was only an intreating him to tarry at Ephesus, to do something left him in charge. Now if Eusebius, a famous writer, thought

it so difficult to tell who were appointed Bishops by the Apostles, much more may we think it difficult to Leontius, an obscure Bishop, speaking beyond his own diocese: and certainly much more hard was it for either of them to determine what kind of Bishops these were, if they had so little means to know who they were; and much less reason have we to stand to their definitive sentence, seeing they have been so rash to raise up such lofty Bishops and Bishopricks out of places in scripture merely misunderstood. Thus while we leave the Bible to gad after the traditions of the ancients, we hear the ancients themselves confessing, that what knowledge they had in this point was such as they had gather'd from the bible.

Since therefore antiquity itself hath turn'd over the controversy to that sovereign book which we had fondly straggled from, we shall do better not to detain this venerable apparition of Leontius any longer, but dismiss him with his list of seven and twenty, to sleep unmolested in his former obscurity.

Now for the word *προεσως*, it is more likely that Timothy never knew the word in that sense: it was the vanity of those next succeeding times not to content themselves with the simplicity of scripture-phrases, but must make a new lexicon to name themselves by; one will be call'd *προεσως*, or Antistes, a word of precedence; another would be term'd a Gnostick, as Clemens; a third Sacerdos, or priest, and talks of altars; which was a plain sign that their doctrine began to change, for which they must change their expressions. But that place of Justin Martyr serves rather to convince the author, than to make for him, where the name *προεσως των αδελφων*, the president or pastor of the brethren (for to what end is he their president, but to teach them?) cannot be limited to signify a prelatial bishop, but rather communicates that Greek appellation to every ordinary presbyter: For there he tells what the Christians had wont to do in their several congregations, to read and expound, to pray and administer, all which he says the *προεσως*, or Antistes, did. Are these the offices only of a Bishop, or shall we think that every Congregation where these things were done, which he attributes to this Antistes, had a Bishop present among them? Unless they had as many Antistes as Presbyters, which this place rather seems to imply; and so we may infer even from their own alledg'd authority, "that Antistes was nothing else but Presbyter."

As for that nameless treatise of Timothy's martyrdom, only cited by Photius that liv'd almost 900 years after Christ, it handsomely follows in that author, the martyrdom of the seven sleepers, that slept (I tell you but what mine author says) three hundred seventy and two years; for so long they had been shut up in a cave without meat, and were found living. This story of Timothy's Ephesian Bishoprick, as it follows in order, so may it for truth, if it only subsist upon its own authority, as it doth; for Photius only saith he read it, he does not aver it. That other legendary piece found among the lives of the saints, and sent us from the shop of the Jesuits at Louvain, does but bear the name of Polycrates; how truly, who can tell? and shall have some more weight with us, when Polycrates can persuade us of that which he affirms in the same place of Eusebius's 5th book, that St. John was a priest, and wore the golden Breast-plate: and why should he convince us more with his traditions of Timothy's episcopacy, than he could convince Victor Bishop of Rome with his traditions concerning the feast of Easter, who not regarding his irrefragable instances of examples taken from Philip and his daughters that were prophetesses, or from Polycarpus, no nor from St. John himself, excommunicated both him, and all the Asian Churches, for celebrating their Easter judaically? He may therefore go back to the seven bishops his kinsmen, and make his moan to them, that we esteem his traditional ware, as lightly as Victor did.

Those of Theodoret, Felix, and John of Antioch, are authorities of later times, and therefore not to be receiv'd for their antiquities sake to give in evidence concerning an allegation, wherein writers, so much their elders, we see so easily miscarry. What if they had

had told us that Peter, who as they say left Ignatius Bishop of Antioch, went afterwards to Rome, and was Bishop there, as this Ignatius, and Irenæus, and all antiquity with one mouth deliver? there be nevertheless a number of learned and wise protestants, who have written, and will maintain, that Peter's being at Rome as Bishop, cannot stand with concordance of scripture.

Now come the epistles of Ignatius to shew us first, that Onesimus was Bishop of Ephesus; next, to assert the difference of Bishop and Presbyter: wherein I wonder that men, teachers of the protestant religion, make no more difficulty of imposing upon our belief a supposititious offspring of some dozen epistles, whereof five are rejected as spurious, containing in them heresies and trifles; which cannot agree in chronology with Ignatius, entitling him Archbishop of Antioch Theopolis, which name of Theopolis that city had not till Justinian's time, long after, as Cedrenus mentions; which argues both the barbarous time, and the unskilful fraud of him that foisted this epistle upon Ignatius. In the epistle to those of Tarsus, he condemns them for ministers of Satan, that say, "Christ is God above all." To the Philippians, them that kept their Easter as the Asian Churches, as Polycarpus did, and them that fasted upon any Saturday, or Sunday, except one, he counts as those that had slain the Lord. To those of Antioch, he salutes the Sub-Deacons, Chaunters, Porters, and Exorcists, as if these had been orders of the Church in his time: those other epistles less question'd, are yet so interlarded with corruptions, as may justly indue us with a wholesome suspicion of the rest. As to the Trallians, he writes that, "a Bishop hath power over all beyond all government and authority whatsoever." Surely then no Pope can desire more than Ignatius attributes to every Bishop; but what will become then of the Archbishops and Primate, if every Bishop in Ignatius's judgment be as supreme as a Pope? To the Ephesians, near the very place from whence they fetch their proof for episcopacy, there stands a line that casts an ill hue upon all the epistle; "Let no man err," saith he, "unless a man be within the rays or enclosure of the altar, he is depriv'd of the bread of life." I say not but this may be stretch'd to a figurative construction, but yet it has an ill look, especially being follow'd beneath with the mention of I know not what sacrifices. In the other epistle to Smyrna, wherein is written that "they should follow their Bishop as Christ did his father, and the Presbytery as the Apostles;" not to speak of the insulse, and ill-laid comparison, this cited place lies upon the very brim of a noted corruption, which had they that quote this passage, ventur'd to let us read, all men would have readily seen what grain the testimony had been of, where it is said, that it is not lawful without a Bishop to baptize, nor to offer, nor to do sacrifice." What can our Church make of these phrases but scandalous? And but a little further he plainly falls to contradict the spirit of God in Solomon, judg'd by the words themselves; "My son, saith he, honour God and the King; but I say, honour God and the Bishop as High-Priest, bearing the image of God according to his ruling, and of Christ according to his priesting, and after him honour the King." Excellent Ignatius! can ye blame the Prelates for making much of this epistle? Certainly if this epistle can serve you to set a Bishop above a Presbyter, it may serve you next to set him above a King. These, and other like places in abundance through all those short epistles, must either be adulterate, or else Ignatius was not Ignatius, nor a martyr, but most adulterate, and corrupt himself. In the midst therefore of so many forgeries, where shall we fix to dare say this is Ignatius? As for his stile, who knows it, so disfigured and interrupted as it is? except they think that where they meet with any thing sound, and orthodoxal, there they find Ignatius. And then they believe him not for his own authority, but for a truth's sake, which they derive from elsewhere: to what end then should they cite him as authentic for Episcopacy, when they cannot know what is authentic in him, but by the judgment which they brought with them, and not by any judgment which they might safely learn from him? How can they bring satisfaction from such an author, to whose very essence the Reader must

must be fain to contribute his own understanding? Had God ever intended that we should have sought any part of useful instruction from Ignatius, doubtless he would not have so ill provided for our knowledge, as to send him to our hands in this broken and disjointed plight; and if he intended no such thing, we do injuriously in thinking to taste better the pure evangelic manna, by seasoning our mouths with the tainted scraps and fragments of an unknown table; and searching among the verminous and polluted rags dropt over-worne from the toiling shoulders of time, with these deformedly to quilt and interlace the intire, the spotless, and undecaying robe of truth, the daughter not of time, but of Heaven, only bred up here below in christian hearts, between two grave and holy nurseries, the doctrine and discipline of the Gospel.

Next follows Irenæus Bishop of Lyons, who is cited to affirm, that Polycarpus "was made Bishop of Smyrna by the Apostles," and this, it may seem, none could better tell than he who had both seen and heard Polycarpus: But when did he hear him? himself confesses to Florinus, when he was a boy. Whether that age in Irenæus may not be liable to many mistakings; and whether a boy may be trusted to take an exact account of the manner of a Church-Constitution, and upon what terms, and within what limits, and with what kind of Commission Polycarpus received his charge, let a man consider, ere he be credulous. It will not be deny'd that he might have seen Polycarpus in his youth, a man of great eminence in the Church, to whom the other Presbyters might give way for his virtue, wisdom, and the reverence of his age; and so did Anicetus Bishop of Rome, even in his own city, give him a kind of priority in administering the sacrament, as may be read in Eusebius: but that we should hence conclude a distinct, and superior order from the young observation of Irenæus, nothing yet alledg'd can warrant us; unless we shall believe such as would face us down, that Calvin, and after him Beza were Bishops of Geneva, because that in the unsettled state of the Church, while things were not fully compos'd, their worth and learning cast a greater share of business upon them, and directed men's eyes principally towards them: and yet these men were the dissolvers of episcopacy. We see the same necessity in state-affairs; Brutus that expell'd the Kings out of Rome, was for the time forc'd to be as it were a king himself, till matters were set in order, as in a free commonwealth. He that had seen Pericles lead the Athenians which way he list'd, haply would have said he had been their prince; and yet he was but a powerful and eloquent man in a democracy, and had no more at any time than a temporary and elective sway, which was in the will of the people when to abrogate. And it is most likely that in the Church, they which came after these apostolic men, being less in merit, but bigger in ambition, strove to invade those privileges by intrusion and plea of right, which Polycarpus, and others like him posselt, from the voluntary surrender of men subdu'd by the excellency of their heavenly gifts; which because their successors had not, and so could neither have that authority, it was their policy to divulge that the eminence which Polycarpus and his equals enjoy'd, was by right of constitution, not by free will of condescending. And yet thus far Irenæus makes against them, as in that very place to call Polycarpus an apostolical Presbyter. But what fidelity his relations had in general, we cannot sooner learn than by Eusebius, who near the end of his third book, speaking of Papias a very ancient writer, one that had heard St. John, and was known to many that had seen, and been acquainted with others of the Apostles, but being of a shallow wit, and not understanding those traditions which he receiv'd, fill'd his writings with many new doctrines, and fabulous conceits; he tells us there, that "divers ecclesiastical men, and Irenæus among the rest, while they look'd at his antiquity, became infected with his errors." Now if Irenæus were so rash as to take unexamined opinions from an author of so small capacity, when he was a man, we should be more rash ourselves to rely upon those observations which he made when he was a boy. And this may be a sufficient reason to us why we need no longer muse at the spreading of many idle traditions so soon after the apostles,

eles, whilst such as this Papias had the throwing them about, and the inconsiderate zeal of the next age, that heeded more the person than the doctrine, had the gathering them up. Wherever a man, who had been any way conversant with the Apostles, was to be found, thither flew all the inquisitive ears, although the exercise of right instructing was chang'd into the curiosity of impertinent fabling: where the mind was to be edify'd with solid doctrine, there the fancy was sooth'd with solemn stories: with less fervency was studied what St. Paul, or St. John had written, than was listen'd to one that could say here he taught, here he stood, this was his stature; and thus he went habited, and O happy this house that harbour'd him, and that cold stone whereon he rested, this village wherein he wrought such a miracle, and that pavement bedew'd with the warm effusion of his last blood, that sprouted up into eternal roses to crown his martyrdom. Thus while all their thoughts were pour'd out upon circumstances, and the gazing after such men as had sat at table with the Apostles (many of which Christ hath profess'd, yea, tho' they had cast out Devils in his name, he will not know at the last day) by this means they lost their time, and truanted in the fundamental grounds of saving knowledge, as was seen shortly by their writings. Lastly for Irenæus, we have cause to think him less judicious in his reports from hand to hand of what the Apostles did, when we find him so negligent in keeping the Faith which they writ, as to say in his third book against heresies, that "the obedience of Mary was the cause of salvation to herself, and all mankind;" and in his fifth book, that "as Eve was seduc'd to fly God, so the virgin Mary was persuaded to obey God, that the virgin Mary might be made the advocate of the virgin Eve." Thus if Irenæus for his nearness to the Apostles, must be the patron of Episcopacy to us, it is no marvel though he be the patron of idolatry to the papist, for the same cause. To the epistle of those brethren of Smyrna, that write the martyrdom of Polycarpus, and stile him an apostolical, and propheticall doctor, and Bishop of the Church of Smyrna, I could be content to give some credit for the great honour and affection which I see those brethren bear him, and not undeservedly, if it be true which they there say that he was a prophet, and had a voice from Heaven to comfort him at his death, which they could hear, but the rest could not for the noise and tumult that was in the place; and besides, if his body were so precious to the Christians, that he was never wont to pull off his shoes for one or other that still strove to have the office, that they might come in to touch his feet, yet a light scruple or two I would gladly be resolv'd in: If Polycarpus (who, as they say, was a Prophet that never fail'd in what he foretold) had declar'd to his friends, that he knew by vision, he should die no other death than burning, how it came to pass that the fire when it came to proof, would not do his work, but starting off like a full sail from the mast, did but reflect a golden light upon his unviolated limbs, exhaling such a sweet odour, as if all the incense of Arabia had been burning; insomuch that when the bill-men saw that the fire was overaw'd, and could not do the deed, one of them steps to him and stabs him with a sword, at which wound such abundance of blood gush'd forth, as quench'd the fire. By all this relation it appears not how the fire was guilty of his death, and then how can his prophecy be fulfill'd? Next, how the standers-by could be so soon weary of such a glorious sight, and such a fragrant smell, as to hasten the executioner to put out the fire with the martyr's blood; unless perhaps they thought, as in all perfumes, that the smoak would be more odorous than the flame: yet these good brethren say he was Bishop of Smyrna. No man questions it, if Bishop and Presbyter were anciently all one, and how does it appear by any thing in this testimony that they were not? If among his other high titles of propheticall, apostolical, and most admired of those times, he be also stiled Bishop of the Church of Smyrna in a kind of speech, which the rhetoricians call *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, for his excellence sake, as being the most famous of all the Smyrnian Presbyters; it cannot be proved neither from this nor that other place of Irenæus, that he was therefore in distinct and monarchical order above the other Presbyters; it is more probable,

probable, that if the whole Presbytery had been as renowned as he, they would have term'd every one of them severally Bishop of Smyrna. Hence it is that we read sometimes of two Bishops in one place; and had all the Presbyters there been of like worth, we might perhaps have read of twenty.

Tertullian accosts us next, (for Polycrates hath had his answer) whose testimony, state but the question right, is of no more force to deduce Episcopacy, than the two former. He says that the Church of Smyrna had Polycarpus plac'd there by John, and the Church of Rome, Clement ordain'd by Peter; and so the rest of the Churches did shew what Bishops they had receiv'd by the appointment of the Apostles. None of this will be contradicted, for we have it out of the scripture that Bishops or Presbyters, which were the same, were left by the Apostles in every Church, and they might perhaps give some special charge to Clement, or Polycarpus, or Linus, and put some special trust in them for the experience they had of their faith and constancy; it remains yet to be evinc'd out of this and the like places, which will never be, that the word Bishop is otherwise taken, than in the language of St. Paul, and the Acts, for an order above Presbyters. We grant them Bishops, we grant them worthy men, we grant them plac'd in several Churches by the Apostles; we grant that Irenæus and Tertullian affirm this, but that they were plac'd in a superior order above the Presbytery, shew from all these words why we should grant. 'Tis not enough to say the Apostle left this man Bishop in Rome, and that other in Ephesus, but to shew when they alter'd their own decree set down by St. Paul, and made all the Presbyters underlings to one Bishop. But suppose Tertullian had made an imparity where none was originally, should he move us, that goes about to prove an imparity between God the Father, and God the Son, as these words import in his book against Praxeas? "The Father is the whole substance, but the Son a derivation, and portion of the whole, as he himself professes, because the Father is greater than me." Believe him now for a faithful relater of tradition, whom you see such an unfaithful expounder of the scripture: besides, in his time all allowable tradition was now lost. For this same author whom you bring to testify the ordination of Clement to the Bishoprick of Rome by Peter, testifies also in the beginning of his treatise concerning chastity, that the bishop of Rome did then use to send forth his edicts by the name of Pontifex Maximus, and Episcopus Episcoporum, chief priest, and bishop of bishops: for shame then do not urge that authority to keep up a bishop, that will necessarily engage you to set up a Pope. As little can your advantage be from Hegesippus an historian of the same time not extant, but cited by Eusebius; his words are, that "in every city all things so stood in his time as the law, and the Prophets, and our Lord did preach." If they stood so, then stood not bishops above Presbyters; for what our Lord and his disciples taught, God be thanked, we have no need to go learn of him: and you may as well hope to persuade us out of the same author, that James the brother of our Lord was a Nazarite, and that to him only it was lawful to enter into the holy of holies; that his food was not upon any thing that had life, fish or flesh; that he used no woollen garments, but only linen, and so as he trifles on.

If therefore the tradition of the Church were now grown so ridiculous, and disconsenting from the doctrine of the Apostles, even in those points which were of least moment to men's particular ends, how well may we be assur'd it was much more degenerated in point of Episcopacy, and precedency, things which could afford such plausible pretences, such commodious traverses for ambition, and avarice to lurk behind?

As for those Britain Bishops which you cite, take heed what you do; for our Britain Bishops, less ancient than these, were remarkable for nothing more than their poverty, as Sulpitius Severus, and Beda can remember you of examples good store.

Lastly (for the fabulous Metaphrastes is not worth an answer) that authority of Clemens Alexandrinus is not to be found in all his works; and wherever it be extant, it is in controversy, whether it be Clement's or no; or if it were, it says only that Saint John in
some

some places constituted Bishops: questionless he did, but where does Clemens say he set them above Presbyters? No man will gainsay the constitution of Bishops; but the raising them to a superior, and distinct order above Presbyters, seeing the Gospel makes them one and the same thing, a thousand such allegations as these will not give prelatical Episcopacy one chapel of ease above a parish Church. And thus much for this cloud I cannot say rather than petty-fog of witnesses, with which Episcopal men would cast a mist before us, to deduce their exalted Episcopacy from apostolic times. Now although, as all men well know, it be the wonted shift of error, and fond opinion, when they find themselves outlaw'd by the Bible, and forsaken of sound reason, to betake them with all speed to their old starting-hole of tradition, and that wild, and overgrown covert of antiquity, thinking to farm there at large room, and fine good stabling, yet thus much their own deify'd antiquity betrays them, to inform us that tradition hath had very seldom or never the gift of persuasion; as that which Church-histories report of those East and Western Paschalists, formerly spoken of, will declare. Who would have thought that Polycarpus on the one side could have err'd in what he saw Saint John do, or Anicetus Bishop of Rome on the other side, in what he or some of his friends might pretend to have seen St. Peter or St. Paul do; and yet neither of these could persuade either when to keep Easter? The like frivolous contention troubled the primitive English Churches, while Colmanus, and Wilfride on either side deducing their opinions, the one from the undeniable example of Saint John, and the learned Bishop Anatolius, and lastly the miraculous Columba, the other from Saint Peter and the Nicene council; could gain no ground each of other, till king Oswy perceiving no likelihood of ending the controversy that way, was fain to decide it himself, good king, with that small knowledge wherewith those times had furnish'd him. So when those pious Greek Emperors began, as Cedrenus relates, to put down monks, and abolish images, the old idolaters finding themselves blasted, and driven back by the prevailing light of the scripture, sent out their sturdy Monks call'd the Abramites, to alledge for images the ancient Fathers Dionysius, and this our objected Irenæus: nay, they were so high flown in their antiquity, that they undertook to bring the Apostles, and Luke the Evangelist, yea Christ himself, from certain records that were then current, to patronize their idolatry: yet for all this the worthy Emperor Theophilus, even in those dark times, chose rather to nourish himself and his people with the sincere milk of the gospel, than to drink from the mixt confluence of so many corrupt and poisonous waters, as tradition would have persuaded him to, by most ancient seeming authorities. In like manner all the reform'd Churches abroad, unthroning Episcopacy, doubtless were not ignorant of these testimonies alledg'd to draw it in a line from the Apostles days: for surely the author will not think he hath brought us now any new authorities, or considerations into the world, which the reformers in other places were not advis'd of: and yet we see, the intercession of all these apostolic fathers could not prevail with them to alter their resolv'd decree of reducing into order their usurping and over-provender'd Episcopants; and God hath blessed their work this hundred years with a prosperous and stedfast, and still happy success. And this may serve to prove the insufficiency of these present Episcopal testimonies, not only in themselves, but in the account of those ever that have been the followers of truth. It will next behoove us to consider the inconvenience we fall into, by using ourselves to be guided by these kind of testimonies. He that thinks it the part of a well-learned man to have read diligently the ancient stories of the Church, and to be no stranger in the volumes of the fathers, shall have all judicious men consenting with him; not hereby to controul, and new-fangle the scripture, God forbid! but to mark how corruption and Apostacy crept in by degrees, and to gather up wherever we find the remaining sparks of original truth, wherewith to stop the mouths of our adversaries, and to bridle them with their own curb, who willingly pass by that which is orthodoxal in them, and studiously cull out that which is commentitious, and best for their turns, not weighing

the fathers in the balance of scripture, but scripture in the balance of the fathers. If we therefore, making first the gospel our rule and oracle, shall take the good which we light on in the fathers, and set it to oppose the evil which other men seek from them, in this way of skirmish we shall easily master all superstition and false doctrine; but if we turn this our discreet and wary usage of them into a blind devotion towards them, and whatsoever we find written by them; we both forsake our own grounds and reasons which led us at first to part from Rome, that is, to hold to the scriptures against all antiquity; we remove our cause into our adversaries own court, and take up there those cast principles which will soon cause us to fodder up with them again; inasmuch as believing antiquity for itself in any one point, we bring an engagement upon ourselves of assenting to all that it charges upon us. For suppose we should now, neglecting that which is clear in scripture, that a Bishop and Presbyter is all one both in name and office, and that what was done by Timothy and Titus, executing an extraordinary place, as fellow-labourers with the Apostles, and of a universal charge in planting Christianity through divers regions, cannot be drawn into particular and daily example; suppose that neglecting this clearness of the text, we should by the uncertain, and corrupted writings of succeeding times, determine that Bishop and Presbyter are different, because we dare not deny what Ignatius, or rather the Perkin Warbeck of Ignatius, says; then must we be constrained to take upon ourselves a thousand superstitions and falsities which the Papists will prove us down in from as good authorities, and as ancient as these that set a Bishop above a Presbyter. And the plain truth is, that when any of our men of those that are wedded to antiquity come to dispute with a Papist, and leaving the scriptures put themselves without appeal to the sentence of Synods and councils, using in the cause of Sion the hir'd soldiery of revolted Israel; where they give the Romanists one buff, they receive two counterbuffs. Were it therefore but in this regard, every true Bishop should be afraid to conquer in his cause by such authorities as these, which if we admit for the authority's sake, we open a broad passage for a multitude of doctrines that have no ground in scripture to break in upon us.

Lastly, I do not know, it being undeniable that there are but two ecclesiastical orders, bishops and deacons, mention'd in the Gospel, how it can be less than impiety to make a demur at that, which is there so perspicuous, confronting and paralleling the sacred verity of St. Paul with the offals and sweepings of antiquity, that met as accidentally and absurdly, as Epicurus his atoms, to patch up a Leucippean Ignatius, inclining rather to make this phantasm an expounder, or indeed a depraver of St. Paul, than Saint Paul an examiner, and discoverer of this impostorship; nor caring how slightly they put off the verdict of holy text unsalv'd, that says plainly there be but two orders, so they maintain the reputaion of their imaginary doctor that proclaims three. Certainly if Christ's apostle have set down but two, then according to his own words, though he himself should unsay it, and not only the angel of Smyrna, but an angel from heaven should bear us down that there be three, Saint Paul has doom'd him twice, "Let him be accurs'd;" for Christ hath pronounc'd that no tittle of his word shall fall to the ground; and if one jot be alterable, it is as possible that all should perish: and this shall be our Righteousness, our ample warrant, and strong assurance both now, and at the last day, never to be asham'd of, against all the heaped names of angels, and martyrs, councils, and fathers urg'd upon us, if we have given ourselves up to be taught by the pure and living precept of God's word only; which without more additions, nay with a forbidding of them, hath within itself the promise of eternal life, the end of all our wearisome labours, and all our sustaining hopes. But if any shall strive to set up his Ephod, and Teraphim of antiquity against the brightness and perfection of the Gospel; let him fear lest he and his Baal be turn'd into Bosheth. And thus much may suffice to shew that the pretended Episcopacy cannot be deduc'd from the Apostolical TIMES.

THE

THE
Reason of CHURCH-GOVERNMENT

Urg'd against

P R E L A T Y.

In TWO BOOKS.

The PREFACE.

IN the publishing of human laws, which for the most part aim not beyond the good of civil society, to set them barely forth to the people without reason or preface, like a physical prescript, or only with threatnings, as it were a lordly command, in the judgment of Plato was thought to be done neither generously nor wisely. His advice was, seeing that persuation certainly is a more winning, and more manlike way to keep men in obedience than fear, that to such laws as were of principal moment, there should be us'd as an induction, some well-temper'd discourse, shewing how good, how gainful, how happy it must needs be to live according to honesty and justice; which being utter'd with those native colours and graces of speech, as true eloquence, the daughter of virtue, can best bestow upon her mother's praises, would so incite, and in a manner charm the multitude into the love of that which is really good, as to embrace it ever after, not of custom and awe, which most men do, but of choice and purpose, with true and constant delight. But this practice we may learn from a better and more ancient authority than any heathen writer hath to give us; and indeed being a point of so high wisdom and worth, how could it be but we should find it in that book, within whose sacred context all wisdom is unfolded? Moses therefore the only lawgiver that we can believe to have been visibly taught of God, knowing how vain it was to write laws to men whose hearts were not first season'd with the knowledge of God and of his works, began from the book of Genesis, as a prologue to his laws; which Josephus right well hath noted: That the nation of the Jews, reading therein the universal goodness of God to all creatures in the creation, and his peculiar favour to them in his election of Abraham their ancestor, from whom they could derive so many blessings upon themselves, might be mov'd to obey sincerely, by knowing so good a reason of their obedience. If then in the administration of civil justice, and under the obscurity of ceremonial rites, such care was had by the wisest of the heathen, and by Moses among the Jews, to instruct them at least in a general reason of that government to which their subjection was requir'd; how much more ought the members of the Church under the gospel, seek to inform their understanding in the reason of that government which the Church claims to have over them? especially for that the Church hath in her immediate cure those inner parts and affections of the mind where the seat of reason is, having power to examine our spiritual knowledge, and to demand from us, in God's behalf, a service entirely reasonable. But because about the manner and order of this government, whether it ought to be presbyterial or prelatical, such endless question, or rather uproar is arisen in this land, as may be justly term'd what the fever is to the physicians, the eternal reproach of our divines; whilst other profound clerks of late greatly, as they conceive, to the advancement of prelaty, are so earnestly meting out the Lydian proconsular Asia, to make good the

prime metropolis of Ephesus, as if some of our prelates in all haste meant to change their soil, and become neighbours to the English Bishop of Chalcedon; and whilst good Breerwood as busily bestirs himself in our vulgar tongue, to divide precisely the three patriarchates of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch; and whether to any of these England doth belong: I shall in the mean while not cease to hope, through the mercy and grace of Christ, the head and husband of his Church, that England shortly is to belong, neither to See Patriarchal, nor See Prelatical, but to the faithful feeding and disciplining of that ministerial order, which the blessed Apostles constituted throughout the Churches; and this I shall essay to prove, can be no other than that of Presbyters and Deacons. And if any Man incline to think I undertake a task too difficult for my years, I trust, through the supreme inlightning assistance far otherwise; for my years, be they few or many, what imports it? so they bring reason, let that be look'd on: and for the task, from hence that the question in hand is so needful to be known at this time, chiefly by every meaner capacity, and contains in it the explication of many admirable and heavenly privileges reach'd out to us by the gospel, I conclude the task must be easy: God having to this end ordained his gospel to be the revelation of his power and wisdom in Christ Jesus. And this is one depth of his wisdom, that he could so plainly reveal so great a measure of it to the gross distorted apprehension of decay'd mankind. Let others therefore dread and shun the scriptures for their darkness, I shall wish I may deserve to be reckoned among those who admire and dwell upon them for their clearness. And this seems to be the cause why in those places of holy writ, wherein is treated of Church-Government, the reasons thereof are not formally and professedly set down, because to him that heeds attentively the drift and scope of Christian Profession, they easily imply themselves; which thing further to explain, having now prefac'd enough, I shall no longer defer.

C H A P. I.

That church-government is prescribed in the Gospel, and that to say otherwise is unsound.

THE first and greatest reason of church-government, we may securely, with the assent of many on the adverse part, affirm to be, because we find it so ordained and set out to us by the appointment of God in the scriptures; but whether this be presbyterial, or prelatical, it cannot be brought to the scanning, until I have said what is meet to some who do not think it for the ease of their inconsequent opinions, to grant that church-discipline is platformed in the bible, but that it is left to the discretion of men. To this conceit of theirs I answer, that it is both unsound and untrue; for there is not that thing in the world of more grave and urgent importance throughout the whole life of man, than is discipline. What need I instance? He that hath read with judgment, of nations and common-wealths, of cities and camps, of peace and war, sea and land, will readily agree that the flourishing and decaying of all civil societies, all the moments and turnings of human occasions are moved to and fro as upon the axle of discipline. So that whatsoever power or sway in mortal things weaker men have attributed to fortune, I durst with more confidence (the honour of divine providence ever saved) ascribe either to the vigour or the slackness of discipline. Nor is there any sociable perfection in this life, civil or sacred, that can be above discipline; but she is that which with her musical cords preserves and holds all the parts thereof together. Hence in those perfect armies of Cyrus in Xenophon, and Scipio in the Roman stories, the excellence of military skill was esteemed, not by the not needing, but by the readiest submitting to the edicts of their commander. And certainly discipline

cipline is not only the removal of disorder; but if any visible shape can be given to divine things, the very visible shape and image of virtue, whereby she is not only seen in the regular gestures and motions of her heavenly paces as she walks, but also makes the harmony of her voice audible to mortal ears. Yea, the angels themselves, in whom no disorder is feared, as the apostle that saw them in his rapture describes, are distinguished and quartered into their celestial principdoms and satrapies, according as God himself has writ his imperial decrees through the great provinces of heaven. The state also of the blessed in paradise, though never so perfect, is not therefore left without discipline, whose golden surveying reed marks out and measures every quarter and circuit of New Jerusalem. Yet is it not to be conceived that those eternal effluences of sanctity and love in the glorified saints, should by this means be confined and cloyed with repetition of that which is prescribed, but that our happiness may orb itself into a thousand vagancies of glory and delight, and with a kind of eccentric equation be, as it were, an invariable planet of joy and felicity; how much less can we believe that God would leave his frail and feeble, tho' not less beloved church here below, to the perpetual stumble of conjecture and disturbance in this our dark voyage, without the card and compass of discipline? which is so hard to be of man's making, that we may see even in the guidance of a civil state to worldly happiness, it is not for every learned, or every wise man, though many of them consult in common, to invent or frame a discipline: but if it be at all the work of man, it must be of such a one as is a true knower of himself, and in whom contemplation and practice, wit, prudence, fortitude, and eloquence, must be rarely met, both to comprehend the hidden causes of things, and span in his thoughts all the various effects that passion or complexion can work in man's nature; and hereto must his hand be at defiance with gain, and his heart in all virtues heroic: so far is it from the ken of these wretched projectors of ours, that bescaul their pamphlets every day with new forms of government for our church. And therefore all the ancient lawgivers were either truly inspired, as Moses, or were such men as with authority enough might give it out to be so, as Minos, Lycurgus, Numa, because they wisely forethought that men would never quietly submit to such a discipline as had not more of God's hand in it than man's. To come within the narrowness of household-government, observation will shew us many deep counsellors of state and judges to demean themselves incorruptly in the settled course of affairs, and many worthy preachers upright in their lives, powerful in their audience: but look upon either of these men where they are left to their own disciplining at home, and you shall soon perceive, for all their single knowledge and uprightness, how deficient they are in the regulating of their own family; not only in what may concern the virtuous and decent composure of their minds in their several places, but that which is of a lower and easier performance, the right possessing of the outward vessel, their body, in health or sickness, rest or labour, diet or abstinence, whereby to render it more pliant to the soul, and useful to the common-wealth: which if men were but as good to discipline themselves, as some are to tutor their horses and hawks, it could not be so gross in most households. If then it appear so hard, and so little known how to govern a house well, which is thought of so easy discharge, and for every man's undertaking; what skill of man, what wisdom, what parts can be sufficient to give laws and ordinances to the elect household of God? If we could imagine that he had left it at random without his provident and gracious ordering, who is he so arrogant, so presumptuous, that durst dispose and guide the living ark of the Holy Ghost, though he should find it wandering in the field of Bethshemesh, without the conscious warrant of some high calling? But no profane insolence can parallel that which our prelates dare avouch, to drive outrageously, and shatter the holy ark of the church, not borne upon their shoulders with pains and labour in the word, but drawn with rude oxen their officials, and their own brute inventions. Let them make shews of reforming while they will, so long as the church is mounted upon the prelatial cart, and not as it ought, between the hands of the ministers, it will but shake and totter; and he that sets to his

hand, though with a good intent to hinder the shogging of it, in this unlawful waggonry wherein it rides, let him beware it be not fatal to him as it was to Uzza. Certainly if God be the Father of his family the church, wherein could he express that name more, than in training it up under his own all-wise and dear oeconomy, not turning it loose to the havock of strangers and wolves, that would ask no better plea than this to do in the church of Christ, whatever humour, faction, policy, or licentious will would prompt them to? Again, if Christ be the Church's husband, expecting her to be presented before him a pure unspotted virgin; in what could he shew his tender love to her more, than in prescribing his own ways, which he best knew would be to the improvement of her health and beauty, with much greater care doubtless than the Persian king could appoint for his queen Esther, those maiden dietings and set prescriptions of baths and odours, which may render her at last the more amiable to his eye? for of any age or sex, most unfitly may a virgin be left to an uncertain and arbitrary education. Yea, though she be well instructed, yet is she still under a more strait tuition, especially if betrothed. In like manner the church bearing the same resemblance, it were not reason to think she should be left destitute of that care which is as necessary and proper to her, as instruction. For publick preaching indeed is the gift of the spirit, working as best seems to his secret will; but discipline is the practic work of preaching directed and applied, as is most requisite, to particular duty; without which it were all one to the benefit of souls, as it would be to the cure of bodies, if all the physicians in London should get into the severall pulpits of the city, and assembling all the diseased in every parish, should begin a learned lecture of pleurifies, palsies, lethargies, to which perhaps none there present were inclined; and so without so much as feeling one pulse, or giving the least order to any skilful apothecary, should dismiss them from time to time, some groaning, some languishing, some expiring, with this only charge, to look well to themselves, and do as they hear. Of what excellence and necessity then church-discipline is, how beyond the faculty of man to frame, and how dangerous to be left to man's invention, who would be every foot turning it to sinister ends; how properly also it is the work of God as father, and of Christ as husband of the church; we have by thus much heard.

CHAP. II.

That church-government is set down in holy scripture, and that to say otherwise is untrue.

AS therefore it is unsound to say, that God hath not appointed any set government in his church, so is it untrue. Of the time of the law there can be no doubt; for to let pass the first institution of priests and Levites, which is too clear to be insisted upon, when the temple came to be built, which in plain judgment could breed no essential change either in religion, or in the priestly government; yet God, to shew how little he could endure that men should be tampering and contriving in his worship, though in things of less regard, gave to David for Solomon, not only a pattern and model of the temple, but a direction for the courses of the priests and Levites, and for all the work of their service. At the return from the captivity, things were only restored after the ordinance of Moses and David; or if the least alteration be to be found, they had with them inspired men, prophets; and it were not sober to say they did aught of moment without divine intimation. In the prophecy of Ezekiel, from the 40th chapter onward, after the destruction of the temple, God by his prophet seeking to wean the hearts of the Jews from their old law, to expect a new and more perfect reformation under Christ, sets out before their eyes the stately fabric and constitution of his church, with all the ecclesiastical functions appertaining:

taining : indeed the description is as sorted best to the apprehension of those times, typical and shadowy, but in such manner as never yet came to pass, nor ever must literally, unless we mean to annihilate the gospel. But so exquisite and lively the description is in portraying the new state of the church, and especially in those points where government seems to be most active, that both Jews and Gentiles might have good cause to be assured, that God, whenever he meant to reform his church, never intended to leave the government thereof, delineated here in such curious architecture, to be patched afterwards, and varnished over with the devices and imbellishings of man's imagination. Did God take such delight in measuring out the pillars, arches, and doors of a material temple? was he so punctual and circumspect in lavers, altars, and sacrifices soon after to be abrogated, lest any of these should have been made contrary to his mind? Is not a far more perfect work, more agreeable to his perfection in the most perfect state of the church militant, the new alliance of God to man? Should not he rather now by his own prescribed discipline have cast his line and level upon the soul of man which is his rational temple, and by the divine square and compass thereof, form and regenerate in us the lovely shapes of virtues and graces, the sooner to edify and accomplish that immortal stature of Christ's body, which is his church, in all her glorious lineaments and proportions? And that this indeed God hath done for us in the gospel we shall see with open eyes, not under a veil. We may pass over the history of the Acts and other places, turning only to those epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus; where the spiritual eye may discern more goodly and gracefully erected, than all the magnificence of temple or tabernacle, such a heavenly structure of evangelic discipline, so diffusive of knowledge and charity to the prosperous increase and growth of the Church, that it cannot be wondered if that elegant and artful symmetry of the promised new temple in Ezekiel, and all those sumptuous things under the law were made to signify the inward beauty and splendor of the Christian Church thus govern'd. And whether this be commanded, let it now be judg'd. St. Paul after his preface to the first of Timothy, which he concludes in the 17th verse with Amen, enters upon the subject of his epistle, which is to establish the Church-Government, with a command: "This charge I commit to thee, Son Timothy; according to the prophecies which went before on thee, that thou by them mightest war a good warfare." Which is plain enough thus expounded: This charge I commit to thee, wherein I now go about to instruct thee how thou shalt set up Church-discipline, that thou mightest war a good warfare, bearing thyself constantly and faithfully in the Ministry, which in the first to the Corinthians is also called a warfare; and so after a kind of parenthesis concerning Hymenæus, he returns to his command, though under the mild word of exhorting, Chap. II. ver. 1. "I exhort therefore;" as if he had interrupted his former command by the occasional mention of Hymenæus. More beneath in the 14th verse of the 3d chapter, when he hath delivered the duties of Bishops or Presbyters, and Deacons, not once naming any other order in the Church, he thus adds; "These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly (such necessity it seems there was) but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God." From this place it may be justly asked, whether Timothy by this here written, might know what was to be known concerning the orders of Church governors or no? If he might, then in such a clear text as this may we know too without further jangle; if he might not, then did St. Paul write insufficiently, and moreover said not true, for he saith here he might know; and I persuade myself he did know ere this was written, but that the Apostle had more regard to the instruction of us, than to the informing of him. In the fifth Chapter, after some other Church-Precepts concerning discipline, mark what a dreadful command follows, ver. 21. "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect Angels, that thou observe these things." And as if all were not yet sure enough, he closes up the epistle with an adjuring charge thus; "I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickneth all things,

and

and before Christ Jesus, that thou keep this commandment:" that is, the whole commandment concerning discipline, being the main purpose of the epistle: altho' Hooker would fain have this denouncement refer'd to the particular precept going before, because the word commandment is in the singular number, not remembering that even in the first chapter of this epistle, the word commandment is used in a plural sense, ver. 5. "Now the end of the commandment is charity:" And what more frequent than in like manner to say, the law of Moses? So that either to restrain the significance too much, or too much to enlarge it, would make the adjuration either not so weighty, or not so pertinent. And thus we find here that the rules of Church-discipline are not only commanded, but hedg'd about with such a terrible impalement of commands, as he that will break through wilfully to violate the least of them, must hazard the wounding of his conscience even to death. Yet all this notwithstanding, we shall find them broken well nigh all by the fair pretenders even of the next ages. No less to the contempt of him whom they feign to be the Archfounder of Prelaty, St. Peter, who by what he writes in the 5th chapter of his first Epistle, should seem to be far another man than tradition reports him: there he commits to the Presbyters only full authority, both of feeding the flock and episcopating; and commands that obedience be given to them as to the mighty hand of God, which is his mighty ordinance. Yet all this was as nothing to repel the ventrous boldness of innovation that ensued, changing the decrees of God that are immutable, as if they had been breath'd by man. Nevertheless when Christ, by those visions of St. John, foreshews the reformation of his Church, he bids him take his reed, and mete it out again after the first pattern, for he prescribes him no other. "Arise, said the Angel, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein." What is there in the world can measure men but discipline? Our word ruling imports no less. Doctrine indeed is the measure, or at least the reason of the measure, 'tis true; but unless the measure be applied to that which it is to measure, how can it actually do its proper work? Whether therefore discipline be all one with doctrine, or the particular application thereof to this or that person, we all agree that doctrine must be such only as is commanded; or whether it be something really differing from doctrine, yet was it only of God's appointment, as being the most adequate measure of the Church and her Children, which is here the office of a great evangelist, and the reed given him from Heaven. But that part of the temple which is not thus measured, so far is it from being in God's tuition or delight, that in the following verse he rejects it; however, in shew and visibility it may seem a part of his Church, yet in as much as it lies thus unmeasur'd, he leaves it to be trampled by the gentiles; that is, to be polluted with idolatrous and gentilish rites and ceremonies. And that the principal reformation here foretold, is already come to pass, as well in discipline as in doctrine, the state of our neighbour Churches afford us to behold. Thus through all the periods and changes of the Church, it hath been proved that God hath still reserved to himself the right of enacting Church-government.

C H A P. III.

That it is dangerous and unworthy the Gospel, to hold that church-government is to be pattern'd by the Law, as Bishop Andrews and the Primate of Armagh maintain.

WE may return now from this interposing difficulty thus remov'd, to affirm, that since church-government is so strictly commanded in God's word, the first and greatest reason why we should submit thereto, is because God hath so commanded. But whether

whether of these two, Prelaty, or Presbytery can prove itself to be supported by this first and greatest reason, must be the next dispute: wherein this position is to be first laid down, as granted; that I may not follow a chase rather than an argument, that one of these two, and none other, is of God's ordaining; and if it be, that ordinance must be evident in the gospel. For the imperfect and obscure institution of the law, which the Apostles themselves doubt not oft times to villify, cannot give rules to the compleat and glorious ministration of the gospel, which looks on the law as on a child, not as on a tutor. And that the Prelates have no sure foundation in the gospel, their own guiltiness doth manifest; they would not else run questing up as high as Adam to fetch their original, as 'tis said one of them lately did in public. To which assertion, had I heard it, because I see they are so insatiable of antiquity, I should have gladly assented, and confest them yet more ancient: For Lucifer before Adam, was the first prelate angel; and both he, as is commonly thought, and our forefather Adam, as we all know, for aspiring above their orders, were miserably degraded. But others better advis'd, are content to receive their beginning from Aaron and his sons, among whom Bishop Andrews of late years, and in these times the primate of Armagh, for their learning, are reputed the best able to say what may be said in this opinion. The primate in his discourse about the original of Episcopacy newly revis'd, begins thus: "The ground of Episcopacy is fetch'd partly from the pattern prescribed by God in the Old Testament, and partly from the imitation thereof brought in by the Apostles." Herein I must entreat to be excus'd of the desire I have to be satisfy'd, how for example the ground of Episcopacy is fetch'd partly from the example of the Old Testament, by whom next, and by whose authority. Secondly, how the Church-government under the Gospel, can be rightly call'd an imitation of that in the Old Testament; for that the Gospel is the end and fulfilling of the law, our liberty also from the bondage of the law, I plainly read. How then the ripe age of the Gospel should be put to school again, and learn to govern herself from the infancy of the law, the stronger to imitate the weaker, the freeman to follow the captive, the learn'd to be lesson'd by the rude, will be a hard undertaking to evince from any of those principles which either art or inspiration hath written. If any thing done by the Apostles may be drawn howsoever to a likeness of something mosaical, if it cannot be prov'd that it was done of purpose in imitation, as having the right thereof grounded in nature, and not in ceremony or type, it will little avail the matter. The whole Judaic law is either political, (and to take pattern by that, no Christian nation ever thought itself oblig'd in conscience) or moral, which contains in it the observation of whatsoever is substantially, and perpetually true and good, either in religion, or course of life. That which is thus moral, besides what we fetch from those un-written laws and ideas which nature hath ingraven in us, the Gospel, as stands with her dignity most, lectures to us from her own authentic handwriting and command, not copies out from the borrow'd manuscript of a subservient scrawl, by way of imitating: As well might she be said in her sacrament of water, to imitate the baptism of John. What though she retain excommunication us'd in the synagogue, retain the morality of the sabbath? she does not therefore imitate the law her underling, but perfect her. All that was morally deliver'd from the law to the Gospel, in the office of the Priests and Levites, was, that there should be a Ministry set apart to teach and discipline the Church; both which duties the Apostles thought good to commit to the Presbyters. And if any distinction of honour were to be made among them, they directed it should be to those not that only rule well, but especially to those that labour in the word and doctrine. By which we are taught, that laborious teaching is the most honourable prelaty that one Minister can have above another in the Gospel: If therefore the superiority of bishopship be grounded on the priesthood as a part of the moral law, it cannot be said to be an imitation; for it were ridiculous that morality should imitate morality, which ever was the same thing. This very word of patterning or imi-

tating, excludes Episcopacy from the solid and grave Ethical law, and betrays it to be a mere child of ceremony, or likelier some misbegotten thing, that having pluckt the gay feathers of her obsolete bravery, to hide her own deformed barrenness, now vaunts and glories in her stolen plumes. In the mean while, what danger there is against the very life of the Gospel, to make in any thing the Typical law her pattern, and how impossible in that which touches the priestly government, I shall use such light as I have receiv'd, to lay open. It cannot be unknown by what expressions the holy Apostle St. Paul spares not to explain to us the nature and condition of the law, calling those ordinances which were the chief and essential offices of the priests, the elements and rudiments of the world, both weak and beggarly. Now to breed, and bring up the children of the promise, the heirs of liberty and grace, under such a kind of government as is profess'd to be but an imitation of that Ministry which engender'd to bondage the sons of Agar; how can this be but a foul injury and derogation, if not a cancelling of that birth-right and immunity which Christ hath purchas'd for us with his blood? For the ministration of the law consisting of carnal things, drew to it such a Ministry as consisted of carnal respects, dignity, precedence, and the like. And such a Ministry establish'd in the Gospel, as is founded upon the points and terms of superiority, and nests itself in worldly honours, will draw to it, and we see it doth, such a religion as runs back again to the old pomp and glory of the flesh: For doubtless there is a certain attraction and magnetick force betwixt the religion and the ministerial form thereof. If the religion be pure, spiritual, simple and lowly, as the Gospel most truly is, such must the face of the Ministry be. And in like manner if the form of the ministry be grounded in the worldly degrees of authority, honour, temporal jurisdiction, we see with our eyes it will turn the inward power and purity of the gospel into the outward carnality of the law; evaporating and exhaling the internal worship into empty conformities, and gay shews. And what remains then but that we should run into as dangerous and deadly apostacy as our lamentable neighbours the Papists, who by this very snare and pitfall of imitating the ceremonial law, fell into that irrecoverable superstition, as must needs make void the covenant of salvation to them that persist in this blindness?

CH A P. IV.

That it is impossible to make the priesthood of Aaron a pattern whereon to ground Episcopacy.

THAT which was promis'd next, is to declare the impossibility of grounding evangelic government in the imitation of the Jewish priesthood; which will be done by considering both the quality of the persons, and the office itself. Aaron and his sons were the princes of their tribe before they were sanctify'd to the priesthood: that personal eminence which they held above the other Levites, they receiv'd not only from their office, but partly brought it into their office; and so from that time forward the priests were not chosen out of the whole number of the Levites, as our Bishops, but were born inheritors of the dignity. Therefore unless we shall chuse our Prelates only out of the nobility, and let them run in a blood, there can be no possible imitation of lording over their brethren in regard of their persons altogether unlike. As for the office, which was a representation of Christ's own person more immediately in the high-priest, and of his whole priestly office in all the other, to the performance of which the Levites were but as servitors and deacons, it was necessary there should be a distinction of dignity between two functions of so great odds. But there being no such difference among our Ministers, unless it be in reference to the deacons, it is impossible to found a Prelaty upon the imitation of this priesthood: For wherein, or in what work is the office of a prelate

prelate excellent above that of a pastor? In ordination, you'll say; but flatly against Scripture: for there we know Timothy receiv'd ordination by the hands of the Presbytery, notwithstanding all the vain delusions that are us'd to evade that testimony, and maintain an unwarrantable usurpation. But wherefore should ordination be a cause of setting up a superior degree in the Church? Is not that whereby Christ became our Saviour a higher and greater work, than that whereby he did ordain messengers to preach and publish him our Saviour? Every Minister sustains the person of Christ in his highest work of communicating to us the mysteries of our salvation, and hath the power of binding and absolving; how should he need a higher dignity to represent or execute that which is an inferior work in Christ? Why should the performance of ordination, which is a lower office, exalt a prelate, and not the seldom discharge of a higher and more noble office, which is preaching and administering, much rather depress him? Verily, neither the nature, nor the example of ordination doth any way require an imparity between the ordainer and the ordained: For what more natural than every like to produce his like, man to beget man, fire to propagate fire? And in examples of highest opinion the ordainer is inferior to the ordained; for the Pope is not made by the precedent Pope, but by Cardinals, who ordain and consecrate to a higher and greater office than their own.

C H A P. V.

To the arguments of Bishop Andrews, and the Primate.

IT follows here to attend to certain objections in a little treatise lately printed among others of like sort at Oxford, and in the title said to be out of the rude draughts of Bishop Andrews: And surely they be rude draughts indeed, in so much that it is marvel to think what his friends meant to let come abroad such shallow reasonings with the name of a man so much bruited for learning. In the 12 and 23 pages he seems most notoriously inconstant to himself; for in the former place he tells us he forbears to take any argument of prelacy from Aaron, as being the type of Christ. In the latter he can forbear no longer, but repents him of his rash gratuity, affirming, that to say, Christ being come in the flesh, his figure in the high-priest ceaseth, is the shift of an Anabaptist; and stily argues, that Christ being as well King as Priest, was as well fore-resembled by the kings then, as by the high-priest: So that if his coming take away the one type, it must also the other. Marvellous piece of divinity! and well worth that the land should pay six thousand pounds a year for, in a bishoprick; altho' I read of no sophiller among the Greeks that was so dear, neither Hippias nor Protagoras, nor any whom the Socratic school famously refuted without hire. Here we have the type of the king sew'd to the tippet of the Bishop, sutt'ly to cast a jealousy upon the crown, as if the right of kings, like Meleager in the Metamorphosis, were no longer-liv'd than the firebrand of prelacy. But more likely the Prelates fearing (for their own guilty carriage protests they do fear) that their fair days cannot long hold, practise by possessing the king with this most false doctrine, to engage his power for them, as in his own quarrel, that when they fall they may fall in a general ruin; just as cruel Tiberius would wish.

“When I die let the earth be rolled in flames.”

But where, O Bishop, doth the purpose of the law set forth Christ to us as a King? That which never was intended in the law can never be abolished as part thereof. When the law was made, there was no King: if before the law, or under the law, God by a special type in any King would fore-signify the future Kingdom of Christ, which is not yet visibly come; what was that to the law? The whole ceremonial law (and types can be in no law else) comprehends nothing but the propitiatory office of Christ's Priesthood, which being in substance accomplish'd, both law and priesthood fades away of itself, and passes into air like a

transitory vision, and the right of Kings neither stands by any type nor falls. We acknowledge that the civil magistrate wears an authority of God's giving, and ought to be obey'd as his vice-gerent. But to make a King a type, we say is an abusive and unskilful speech, and of a moral solidity makes it seem a ceremonial shadow: therefore your typical chain of King and Priest must unlink. But is not the type of Priest taken away by Christ's coming? No, saith this famous protestant Bishop of Winchester, it is not; and he that saith it is, is an Anabaptist. What think ye, Readers, do ye not understand him? What can be gather'd hence, but that the Prelate would still sacrifice? Conceive him, Readers, he would missificate. Their altars indeed were in a fair forwardness; and by such arguments as these they were setting up the molten calf of their mass again, and of their great hierarch the pope. For if the type of Priest be not taken away, then neither of the High-priest, it were a strange beheading; and High-priest more than one there cannot be, and that one can be no less than a Pope. And this doubtless was the bent of his career, though never so covertly. Yea, but there was something else in the High-Priest besides the figure, as is plain by St. Paul's acknowledging him. 'Tis true, that in the 17th of Deut. whence this authority arises to the Priest in matters too hard for the secular judges, as must needs be many in the occasions of those times, involv'd so with ceremonial niceties, no wonder though it be commanded to enquire at the mouth of the Priests, who besides the magistrates their colleagues, had the oracle of Urim to consult with. And whether the High-Priest Ananias had not incroach'd beyond the limits of his priestly authority, or whether he used it rightly, was no time then for St. Paul to contest about. But if this instance be able to assert any right of jurisdiction to the Clergy, it must impart it in common to all Ministers, since it were a great folly to seek for counsel in a hard intricate scruple from a dunce Prelate, when there might be found a speedier solution from a grave and learned minister, whom God hath gifted with the judgment of Urim, more amply oft-times than all the Prelates together; and now in the gospel hath granted the privilege of this oraculous Ephod alike to all his Ministers. The reason therefore of imparity in the Priests, being now, as is aforesaid, really annull'd both in their person, and in their representative office, what right of jurisdiction soever can be from this place levitically bequeath'd, must descend upon the ministers of the gospel equally, as it finds them in all other points equal. Well then, he is finally content to let Aaron go; Eleazar will serve his turn, as being a superior of superiors, and yet no type of Christ in Aaron's life-time. O thou that would'st wind into any figment, or phantasm, to save thy miter! yet all this will not fadge, tho' it be cunningly interpolish'd by some second hand with crooks and emendations: Hear then; the type of Christ in some one particular, as of entring yearly into the Holy of Holies, and such like, rested upon the High-priest only as more immediately personating our Saviour: but to resemble his whole satisfactory office, all the lineage of Aaron was no more than sufficient. And all, or any of the Priests consider'd separately without relation to the highest, are but as a lifeless trunk, and signify nothing. And this shews the excellence of Christ's Sacrifice, who at once and in one person fulfill'd that which many hundreds of Priests many times repeating had enough to foreshew. What other imparity there was among themselves, we may safely suppose it depended on the dignity of their birth and family, together with the circumstances of a carnal service, which might afford many priorities. And this I take to be the sum of what the Bishop hath laid together to make plea for Prelaty by imitation of the law: Though indeed, if it may stand, it will infer Popedom all as well. Many other courses he tries, enforcing himself with much ostentation of endless genealogies, as if he were the man that St. Paul forewarns us of in Timothy, but so unvigourously, that I do not fear his winning of many to his cause, but such as doting upon great names are either over-weak, or over-sudden of faith. I shall not refuse therefore to learn so much prudence as I find in the Roman soldier that attended the cross, not to stand breaking of legs, when the breath is quite out

out of the body, but pass to that which follows. The primate of Armagh at the beginning of his tractate seeks to avail himself of that place in the 66th of Isaiah, "I will take of them for Priests and Levites, saith the Lord," to uphold hereby such a form of superiority among the ministers of the gospel, succeeding those in the law, as the Lord's-day did the Sabbath. But certain if this method may be admitted of interpreting those prophetic passages concerning christian times in a punctual correspondence, it may with equal probability be urg'd upon us, that we are bound to observe some monthly solemnity answerable to the New Moons, as well as the Lord's-day which we keep in lieu of the Sabbath: for in the 23d verse the prophet joins them in the same manner together, as before he did the Priests and Levites, thus. "And it shall come to pass that from one New Moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." Undoubtedly with as good consequence may it be alledg'd from hence, that we are to solemnize some religious monthly meeting different from the Sabbath, as from the other any distinct formality of ecclesiastical orders may be inferr'd. This rather will appear to be the lawful and unconstrain'd sense of the text, that God in taking of them for Priests and Levites, will not esteem them unworthy, though Gentiles, to undergo any function in the Church, but will make of them a full and perfect ministry, as was that of the Priests and Levites in their kind. And Bishop Andrews himself, to end the controversy, sends us a candid exposition of this quoted verse from the 24th page of his said book, plainly deciding that God by those legal names there of Priests and Levites means our Presbyters and Deacons; for which either ingenuous confession, or slip of his pen, we give him thanks, and withal to him that brought these treatises into one volume, who setting the contradictions of two learned men so near together, did not foresee. What other deducements or analogies are cited out of St. Paul to prove a likeness between the ministers of the Old and New Testament, having try'd their sinews, I judge they may pass without harm-doing to our cause. We may remember then that Prelacy neither hath nor can have foundation in the law, nor yet in the gospel; which assertion as being for the plainness thereof a matter of eye-sight, rather than of disquisition, I voluntarily omit; not forgetting to specify this note again, that the earnest desire which the Prelates have to build their hierarchy upon the sandy bottom of the law, gives us to see abundantly the little assurance which they find to rear up their high roofs by the authority of the gospel, repulsed as it were from the writings of the apostles, and driven to take sanctuary among the Jews. Hence that open confession of the Primate before-mention'd; "Episcopacy is fetch'd partly from the pattern of the Old Testament, and partly from the New as an imitation of the Old;" though nothing can be more rotten in divinity than such a position as this, and is all one as to say, Episcopacy is partly of divine institution, and partly of man's own carving. For who gave the authority to fetch more from the pattern of the law than what the Apostles had already fetcht, if they fetcht any thing at all, as hath been prov'd they did not? So was Jeroboam's episcopacy partly from the pattern of the law, and partly from the pattern of his own carnality; a party-colour'd and a party-member'd episcopacy: and what can this be less than a monstrous? Others therefore among the Prelates, perhaps not so well able to brook, or rather to justify this foul relapsing to the old law, have condescended at last to a plain confessing that both the names and offices of Bishops and Presbyters at first were the same, and in the Scriptures no where distinguished. This grants the remonstrant in the fifth section of his defence, and in the Preface to his last short answer. But what need respect be had whether he grant or grant it not, when as through all antiquity, and even in the loftiest times of Prelacy, we find it granted? Jerome the learnedest of the Fathers hides not his opinion, that custom only, which the Proverb calls a tyrant, was the maker of Prelacy; before his audacious workmanship the Churches were rul'd in common by the Presbyters: and such a certain truth this was esteem'd, that it became a decree among the papal canons compiled by Gratian. Anselm

also of Canterbury, who to uphold the points of his Prelatism made himself a traytor to his country, yet commenting the Epistles to Titus and the Philippians, acknowledges from the clearness of the text, what Jerome and the Church-Rubric hath before acknowledged. He little dreamt then that the weeding-hook of reformation would after two ages pluck up his glorious poppy from insulting over the good corn. Though since some of our British Prelates, seeing themselves prest to produce Scripture, try all their cunning, if the New Testament will not help them, to frame of their own heads as it were with wax a kind of mimic Bishop limm'd out to the life of a dead Priesthood: Or else they would strain us out a certain figurative prelate, by wringing the collective allegory of those seven Angels into seven single rochets. Howsoever, since it thus appears that custom was the creator of Prelaty, being less ancient than the government of Presbyters, it is an extreme folly to give them the hearing that tell us of Bishops through so many ages: and if against their tedious muster of citations, fees, and successions, it be reply'd that wagers and Church-antiquities, such as are repugnant to the plain dictate of scripture, are both alike the arguments of fools, they have their answer. We rather are to cite all those ages to an arraignment before the word of God, wherefore, and what pretending, how presuming they durst alter that divine institution of Presbyters, which the Apostles who were no various and inconstant men surely had set up in the Churches; and why they chuse to live by custom and catalogue, or as St. Paul saith by sight and visibility, rather than by faith? But first I conclude from their own mouths, that God's command in scripture, which doubtless ought to be the first and greatest reason of Church-government is wanting to Prelaty. And certainly we have plenteous warrant in the doctrine of Christ to determine that the want of this reason is of itself sufficient to confute all other pretences that may be brought in favour of it.

C H A P. VI.

That Prelaty was not set up for prevention of Schism, as is pretended; or if it were, that it performs not what it was first set up for, but quite the contrary.

YET because it hath the outside of a specious reason, and specious things we know are aptest to work with human lighness and frailty, even against the solideest truth that sounds not plausibly, let us think it worth the examining for the love of infirmer Christians, of what importance this their second reason may be. Tradition they say hath taught them, that for the prevention of growing schism, the Bishop was heav'd above the Presbyter. And must tradition then ever thus to the world's end be the perpetual canker-worm to eat out God's Commandments? Are his decrees so inconsiderate and so fickle, that when the statutes of Solon or Lycurgus shall prove durably good to many ages, his in forty years shall be found defective, ill-contriv'd, and for needful causes to be alter'd? Our Saviour and his Apostles did not only foresee, but foretel and forewarn us to look for Schism. Is it a thing to be imagin'd of God's wisdom, or at least of apostolic prudence, to set up such a government in the tenderness of the Church, as should incline, or not be more able than any others to oppose itself to schism? it was well known what a bold lurker schism was, even in the household of Christ between his own disciples and those of John the Baptist about fasting: and early in the Acts of the Apostles the noise of Schism had almost drown'd the proclaiming of the gospel; yet we read not in scripture that any thought was had of making Prelates, no not in those places where dissention was most rife. If Prelaty had been then esteem'd a remedy against

against Schism, where was it more needful than in that great variance among the Corinthians which St. Paul so laboured to reconcile? and whose eye could have found the fittest remedy sooner than his? and what could have made the remedy more available, than to have used it speedily? And lastly, what could have been more necessary than to have written it for our instruction? yet we see he neither commended it to us, nor used it himself. For the same division remaining there, or else bursting forth again more than twenty years after St. Paul's death, we find in Clement's Epistle of venerable authority, written to the yet factious Corinthians, that they were still govern'd by Presbyters. And the same of other Churches out of Hermas, and divers other the scholars of the Apostles, by the late industry of the learned Salmasius appears. Neither yet did this worthy Clement St. Paul's disciple, though writing to them to lay aside schism, in the least word advise them to change the Presbyterian government into Prelaty. And therefore if God afterward gave or permitted this insurrection of Episcopacy, it is to be fear'd he did it in his wrath, as he gave the Israelites a King. With so good a will doth he use to alter his own chosen government once establish'd. For mark whether this rare device of man's brain, thus preferr'd before the ordinance of God, had better success than fleshly wisdom, not counselling with God, is wont to have. So far was it from removing schism, that if schism parted the congregations before, now it rent and mangled, now it rag'd. Heresy begat heresy with a certain monstrous haste of pregnancy in her birth, at once born and bringing forth. Contentions, before brotherly, were now hostile. Men went to chuse their Bishop as they went to a pitch field, and the day of his election was like the sacking of a city, sometimes ended with the blood of thousands. Nor this among heretics only, but men of the same belief, yea confessors; and that with such odious ambition, that Eusebius in his eighth book testifies he abhorr'd to write. And the reason is not obscure, for the poor dignity, or rather burden, of a parochial Presbyter could not engage any great party, nor that to any deadly feud: but Prelaty was a power of that extent and sway, that if her election were popular, it was seldom not the cause of some faction or broil in the Church. But if her dignity came by favour of some prince, she was from that time his creature, and obnoxious to comply with his ends in state, were they right or wrong. So that instead of finding Prelaty an impeacher of schism or faction, the more I search, the more I grow into all persuasion to think rather that faction and she, as with a spousal ring, are wedded together, never to be divorced. But here let every one behold the just and dreadful judgment of God meeting with the audacious pride of man, that durst offer to mend the ordinances of Heaven. God out of the strife of men brought forth by his Apostles to the Church that beneficent and ever-distributing office of Deacons, the Stewards and Ministers of holy alms: man, out of the pretended care of peace and unity, being caught in the snare of his impious boldness to correct the will of Christ, brought forth to himself upon the Church that irreconcilable schism of perdition and apostacy, the Roman Antichrist; for that the exaltation of the pope arose out of the reason of Prelaty, it cannot be deny'd. And as I noted before, that the pattern of the High-Priest pleaded for in the gospel (for take away the head Priest, the rest are but a carcass) sets up with better reason a pope than an archbishop; for if Prelaty must still rise and rise till it come to a Primate, why should it stay there? when as the catholic government is not to follow the division of kingdoms, the temple best representing the universal Church, and the High-Priest the universal Head: so I observe here, that if to quiet schism there must be one head of Prelaty in a land, or monarchy, rising from a provincial to a national primacy, there may upon better grounds of repressing schism be set up one catholic head over the catholic Church. For the peace and good of the Church is not terminated in the schismless estate of one or two kingdoms, but should be provided for by the joint consultation of all reformed Christendom: that all controversy may end in the final pronounce or canon of one Arch-primate or protestant pope. Although by this means, for aught I see, all
the

the diameters of schism may as well meet and be knit up in the centre of one grand falshood. Now let all impartial men arbitrate what goodly inference these two main reasons of the Prelates have, that by a natural league of consequence make more for the Pope than for themselves; yea, to say more home, are the very womb for a new Sub-antichrist to breed in, if it be not rather the old force and power of the same man of sin counterfeiting protestant. It was not the prevention of schism, but it was schism itself and the hateful thirst of lording in the Church, that first bestow'd a being upon Prelaty; this was the true cause, but the pretence is still the same. The Prelates, as they would have it thought, are the only mawls of schism. Forsooth if they be put down, a deluge of innumerable sects will follow; we shall be all Brownists, Familists, Anabaptists. For the word Puritan seems to be quasht, and all that heretofore were counted such, are now Brownists. And thus do they raise an evil report upon the expected reforming grace that God hath bid us hope for; like those faithless spies, whose carcasses shall perish in the wilderness of their own confused ignorance, and never taste the good of reformation. Do they keep away schism? if to bring a numb and chill stupidity of soul, an unactive blindness of mind upon the people by their leaden doctrine, or no doctrine at all; if to persecute all knowing and zealous Christians by the violence of their courts, be to keep away schism, they keep away schism indeed: and by this kind of discipline all Italy and Spain is as purely and politickly kept from schism as England hath been by them. With as good a plea might the dead-palsy boast to a man, 'tis I that free you from stiches and pains, and the troublesome feeling of cold and heat, of wounds and strokes; if I were gone, all these would molest you. The winter might as well vaunt itself against the spring, I destroy all noisome and rank weeds, I keep down all pestilent vapours; yes, and all wholesome herbs, and all fresh dews, by your violent and hide-bound frost: but when the gentle west winds shall open the fruitful bosom of the earth, thus over-girded by your imprisonment, then the flowers put forth and spring, and then the Sun shall scatter the mists, and the manuring hand of the tiller shall root up all that burdens the soil without thank to your bondage. But far worse than any frozen captivity is the bondage of Prelates; for that other, if it keep down any thing which is good within the earth, so doth it likewise that which is ill; but these let out freely the ill, and keep down the good, or else keep down the lesser ill, and let out the greatest. Be asham'd at last to tell the parliament, ye curb schismatics, whenas they know ye cherish and side with papists, and are now as it were one party with them, and 'tis said they help to petition for ye. Can we believe that your government strains in good earnest at the petty gnats of schism, whenas we see it makes nothing to swallow the camel heresy of Rome, but that indeed your throats are of the right pharisaical strain? Where are those schismatics with whom the Prelates hold such hot skirmish? shew us your acts, those glorious annals which your Courts of loathed memory lately deceas'd have left us? Those schismatics I doubt me will be found the most of them such as whose only schism was to have spoke the truth against your high abominations and cruelties in the Church; this is the schism ye hate most, the removal of your criminous hierarchy. A politic government of yours, and of a pleasant conceit, set up to remove those as a pretended schism, that would remove you as a palpable heresy in government. If the schism would pardon ye that, she might go jagg'd in as many cut and flashes as she pleased for you. As for the rending of the Church, we have many reasons to think it is not that which ye labour to prevent, so much as the rending of your pontifical sleeves: that schism would be the forest schism to you, that would be Brownism and Anabaptism indeed. If we go down, say you, (as if Adrian's wall were broke) a flood of sects will rush in. What sects? What are their opinions? give us the inventory: it will appear both by your former prosecutions and your present instances, that they are only such to speak of, as are offended with your lawless government, your ceremonies, your liturgy, an extract of the mass-book translated. But that they should be contempters of publick prayer, and Churches used without superstition, I

trust

trust God will manifest it e'er long to be as false a slander, as your former slanders against the Scots. Noise it 'till ye be hoarse, that a rabble of sects will come in; it will be answer'd ye, no rabble, Sir Priest, but an unanimous multitude of good protestants will then join to the Church, which now because of you stand separated. This will be the dreadful consequence of your removal. As for those terrible names of sectaries and schismatics which ye have got together, we know your manner of fight, when the quiver of your arguments, which is ever thin, and weakly stor'd, after the first brunt is quite empty, your course is to betake ye to your other quiver of slander, wherein lies your best archery. And whom you could not move by sophistical arguing, them you think to confute by scandalous misnaming; thereby inciting the blinder sort of people to mislike and deride sound doctrine and good christianity, under two or three vile and hateful terms. But if we could easily endure and dissolve your doubtieft reasons in argument, we shall more easily bear the worst of your unreasonableness in calumny and false report: especially being foretold by Christ, that if he our master were by your predecessors call'd Samaritan and Belzebub, we must not think it strange if his best disciples in the reformation, as at first by those of your tribe they were call'd Lollards and Husfites, so now by you be term'd Puritans and Brownists. But my hope is, that the people of England will not suffer themselves to be juggl'd thus out of their faith and religion by a mist of names cast before their eyes, but will search wisely by the scriptures, and look quite through this fraudulent aspersions of a disgraceful name into the things themselves: knowing that the primitive Christians in their times were accounted such as are now call'd Familists and Adamites, or worse. And many on the Prelatic side, like the Church of Sardis, have a name to live, and yet are dead; to be protestants, and are indeed papists in most of their principles. Thus persuaded, this your old fallacy we shall soon unmask, and quickly apprehend how you prevent schism, and who are your schismatics. But what if ye prevent and hinder all good means of preventing schism? That way which the Apostles us'd, was to call a council: from which by any thing that can be learned from the fifteenth of the Acts, no faithful christian was debarr'd, to whom knowledge and piety might give entrance. Of such a council as this every parochial consistory is a right homogeneous and constituting part, being in it self as it were a little synod, and towards a general assembly moving upon her own basis in an even and firm progression, as those smaller squares in battel unite in one great cube, the main Phalanx, an emblem of truth and steadfastness. Whereas on the other side Prelaty ascending by a gradual monarchy from Bishop to Archbishop, from thence to Primate, and from thence, for there can be no reason yielded neither in nature, nor in religion, wherefore, if it have lawfully mounted thus high, it should not be a lordly ascendant in the horoscope of the Church, from primate to patriarch, and so to Pope: I say, Prelaty thus ascending in a continual pyramid upon pretence to perfect the Church's unity, if notwithstanding it be found most needful, yea the utmost help to dearn up the rents of schism by calling a council, what does it but teach us that Prelaty is of no force to effect this work which she boasts to be her master-piece; and that her pyramid aspires and sharpens to ambition, not to perfection or unity? This we know, that as often as any great schism disparts the Church, and synods be proclaim'd, the Presbyters have as great right there, and as free vote of old, as the Bishops, which the canon-law conceals not. So that Prelaty, if she will seek to close up divisions in the Church, must be forced to dissolve and unmake her own pyramidal figure, which she affirms to be of such uniting power, whenas indeed it is the most dividing and schismatical form that geometricians know of, and must be fain to inglobe or incube her self among the Presbyters; which she hating to do, sends her haughty Prelates from all parts with their forked miters, the badge of schism, or the stamp of his cloven foot whom they serve I think, who according to their hierarchies accumulating still higher and higher in a cone of Prelaty, instead of healing up the gashes of the Church, as it happens in such pointed bodies meeting, fall to gore one another

with

with their sharp spires for upper place and precedence, 'till the council itself proves the greatest schism of all. And thus they are so far from hindring dissension, that they have made unprofitable, and even noisome, the chiefest remedy we have to keep Christendom at one, which is by councils: and these, if we rightly consider Apostolic example, are nothing else but general Presbyteries. This seem'd so far from the Apostles to think much of, as if hereby their dignity were impair'd, that, as we may gather by those Epistles of Peter and John, which are likely to be latest written, when the Church grew to a settling, like those heroic patricians of Rome (if we may use such comparison) hasting to lay down their dictatorship, they rejoic'd to call themselves, and to be as fellow-elders among their brethren; knowing that their high office was but as the scaffolding of the Church yet unbuilt, and would be but a troublesome disfigurement, so soon as the building was finish'd. But the lofty minds of an age or two after, such was their small discerning, thought it a poor indignity, that the high-rear'd government of the Church should so on a sudden, as it seem'd to them, squat into a presbytery. Next, or rather before councils, the timeliest prevention of schism is to preach the Gospel abundantly and powerfully throughout all the land, to instruct the youth religiously, to endeavour how the Scriptures may be easiest understood by all men; to all which the proceedings of these men have been on set purpose contrary. But how, O Prelates, should you remove Schism? and how should you not remove and oppose all the means of removing Schism? when Prelaty is a Schism itself from the most reformed and most flourishing of our neighbour Churches abroad, and a sad subject of discord and offence to the whole nation at home. The remedy which you alledge, is the very disease we groan under; and never can be to us a remedy but by removing itself. Your predecessors were believ'd to assume this pre-eminence above their brethren, only that they might appease dissension. Now God and the Church calls upon you, for the same reason, to lay it down, as being to thousands of good men offensive, burdensome, intolerable. Surrender that pledge, which, unless you foully usurpt it, the Church gave you, and now claims it again, for the reason she first lent it. Discharge the trust committed to you, prevent Schism; and that ye can never do, but by discharging your selves. That government which ye hold, we confess, prevents much, hinders much, removes much; but what? the schisms and grievances of the Church? no, but all the peace and unity, all the welfare not of the Church alone, but of the whole kingdom. And if it be still permitted ye to hold, will cause the most sad, I know not whether separation be enough to say, but such a wide gulph of distraction in this land, as will never close her dismal gap until ye be forc'd (for of yourselves you will never do as that Roman Curtius nobly did) for the Church's peace and your country's, to leap into the midst, and be no more seen. By this we shall know whether yours be that ancient Prelaty which you say was first constituted for the reduction of quiet and unanimity into the Church, for then you will not delay to prefer that above your own preferment. If otherwise, we must be confident that your Prelaty is nothing else but your ambition, an insolent preferring of your selves above your brethren; and all your learned scraping in antiquity, even to disturb the bones of old Aaron and his sons in their graves, is but to maintain and set upon our necks a stately and severe dignity, which you call sacred, and is nothing in very deed but a grave and reverent gluttony, a sanctimonious avarice; in comparison of which, all the duties and dearnesses which ye owe to God or to his Church, to law, custom, or nature, ye have resolv'd to set at nought. I could put you in mind what Counsel Clement a fellow-labourer with the Apostles gave to the Presbyters of Corinth, whom the people, though unjustly, sought to remove. "Who among you," saith he, "is noble-minded, who is pitiful, who is charitable? let him say thus; If for me this sedition, this enmity, these differences be, I willingly depart, I go my ways; only let the flock of Christ be at peace with the Presbyters that are set over it. He that shall do this," saith he, "shall get him great honour in the Lord, and all places will receive him." This was Clement's counsel to good

good and holy men, that they should depart rather from their just office, than by their stay to ravle out the seamless garment of concord in the Church. But I have better counsel to give the Prelates, and far more acceptable to their ears; this advice in my opinion is fitter for them: Cling fast to your pontifical sees, bate not, quit your selves like barons, stand to the utmost for your haughty courts and votes in parliament. Still tell us, that you prevent schism, though schism and combustion be the very issue of your bodies, your first born; and set your country a bleeding in a prelatical mutiny, to fight for your pomp, and that ill-favour'd weed of temporal honour that sits dishonourably upon your laic shoulders; that ye may be fat and fleshy, swoln with high thoughts, and big with mischievous designs, when God comes to visit upon you all this fourscore years vexation of his Church under your Egyptian tyranny. For certainly of all those blessed souls which you have persecuted, and those miserable ones which you have lost, the just vengeance does not sleep.

C H A P. VII.

That those many sects and schisms by some suppos'd to be among us, and that rebellion in Ireland, ought not to be a hindrance, but a hastening of reformation.

AS for those many sects and divisions rumour'd abroad to be amongst us, it is not hard to perceive that they are partly the mere fictions and false alarms of the Prelates, thereby to cast amazements and panic terrors into the hearts of weaker christians, that they should not venture to change the present deformity of the Church for fear of I know not what worse inconveniencies. With the same objected fears and suspicions, we know that futtle prelate Gardner sought to divert the reformation. It may suffice us to be taught by St. Paul, that there must be sects for the manifesting of those that are sound-hearted. These are but winds and flaws to try the floating vessel of our faith, whether it be stanch and sail well, whether our ballast be just, our anchorage and cable strong. By this is seen who lives by faith and certain knowledge, and who by credulity and the prevailing opinion of the age; whose virtue is of an unchangeable grain, and whose of a slight wash. If God come to try our constancy, we ought not to shrink or stand the less firmly for that, but pass on with more stedfast resolution to establish the truth, though it were through a lane of sects and heresies on each side. Other things men do to the glory of God: but sects and errors, it seems, God suffers to be for the glory of good men, that the world may know and reverence their true fortitude and undaunted constancy in the truth. Let us not therefore make these things an incumbrance, or an excuse of our delay in reforming, which God sends us as an incitement to proceed with more honour and alacrity. For if there were no opposition, where were the trial of an unfeigned goodness and magnanimity? Virtue that wavers is not virtue, but vice revolted from itself, and after a while returning. The actions of just and pious men do not darken in their middle course; but Solomon tells us, they are as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day. But if we shall suffer the trifling doubts and jealousies of future sects to overcloud the fair beginnings of purpos'd reformation, let us rather fear that another proverb of the same wise man be not upbraided to us, that "the way of the wicked is as darkness, they stumble at they know not what." If sects and schisms be turbulent in the unsettled estate of a Church, while it lies under the amending hand, it best beseems our Christian courage to think they are but as the throws and pangs that go before the birth of reformation, and that the work itself is now in doing. For if we look but on the nature of elemental and mixt things, we know they cannot suffer

any change of one kind or quality into another, without the struggle of contrarities. And in things artificial, seldom any elegance is wrought without a superfluous waste and refuse in the transaction. No marble statue can be politely carv'd, no fair edifice built without almost as much rubbish and sweeping. Infomuch that even in the spiritual conflict of St. Paul's conversion, there fell scales from his eyes that were not perceived before. No wonder then in the reforming of a Church, which is never brought to effect without the fierce encounter of truth and falsehood together, if, as it were the splinters and shares of so violent a jousting, there fall from between the shock many fond errors and fanatic opinions, which when truth has the upper hand, and the reformation shall be perfected, will easily be rid out of the way, or kept so low, as that they shall be only the exercise of our knowledge, not the disturbance or interruption of our faith. As for that which Barclay in his "image of minds," writes concerning the horrible and barbarous conceits of Englishmen in their religion, I deem it spoken like what he was, a fugitive Papist traducing the island whence he sprung. It may be more judiciously gather'd from hence, that the Englishman of many other nations is least atheistical, and bears a natural disposition of much reverence and awe towards the Deity; but in his weakness and want of better instruction, which among us too frequently is neglected, especially by the meaner sort, turning the bent of his own wits, with a scrupulous and ceaseless care, what he might do to inform himself aright of God and his worship, he may fall not unlikely sometimes, as any other land-man, into an uncouth opinion. And verily if we look at his native towardliness in the rough cast without breeding, some nation or other may haply be better compos'd to a natural civility and right judgment than he. But if he get the benefit once of a wise and well rectified nurture, which must first come in general from the godly vigilance of the Church, I suppose that wherever mention is made of countries, manners or men, the English people among the first that shall be prais'd, may deserve to be accounted a right pious, right honest, and right hardy nation. But thus while some stand dallying and deferring to reform for fear of that which should mainly hasten them forward, lest schism and error should encrease, we may now thank ourselves and our delays, if instead of schism a bloody and inhuman rebellion be strook in between our slow movings. Indeed against violent and powerful opposition there can be no just blame of a lingring dispatch. But this I urge against those that discourse it for a maxim, as if the swift opportunities of establishing or reforming religion were to attend upon the steam of state-business. In state many things at first are crude and hard to digest, which only time and deliberation can supple and conccct. But in religion, wherein is no immaturity, nothing out of season, it goes far otherwise. The door of grace turns upon smooth hinges wide opening to send out, but soon shutting to recal the precious offers of mercy to a nation: which unless watchfulness and zeal, two quick-fighted and ready-handed virgins, be there in our behalf to receive, we lose: and still the oftter we lose, the straiter the door opens, and the less is offer'd. This is all we get by demurring in God's service. 'Tis not rebellion that ought to be the hindrance of reformation, but it is the want of this which is the cause of that. The Prelates which boast themselves the only bridlers of schism, God knows have been so cold and backward both there and with us to repress heresy and idolatry, that either through their carelessness or their craft all this mischief is befalln. What can the Irish subjects do less in God's just displeasure against us, than revenge upon English bodies the little care that our Prelates have had of their souls? Nor hath their negligence been new in that island, but ever notorious in queen Elizabeth's days, as Camden their known friend forbears not to complain. Yet so little are they toucht with remorse of these their cruelties, (for these cruelties are theirs, the bloody revenge of those souls which they have famish'd,) that whenas against our brethren the Scots, who by their upright and loyal deeds have now bought themselves an honourable name to posterity, whatsoever malice by slander could invent, rage in hostility attempt, they greedily attempted; toward these murderous Irish, the enemies of God and mankind,

a cursed off-spring of their own connivance, no man takes notice but that they seem to be very calmly and indifferently affected. Where then should we begin to extinguish a rebellion that hath its cause from the misgovernment of the Church? where, but at the Church's reformation, and the removal of that government which pursues and wars with all good Christians under the name of schismatics, but maintains and fosters all Papists and Idolaters as tolerable Christians? And if the sacred Bible may be our light, we are neither without example, nor the witness of God himself, that the corrupted estate of the Church is both the cause of tumult and civil wars, and that to stint them, the peace of the Church must first be settled. "Now for a long season," saith Azariah to king Aza, "Israel hath been without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without law: and in those times there was no peace to him that went out, nor to him that came in, but great vexations were upon all the inhabitants of the countries. And nation was destroyed of nation, and city of city, for God did vex them with all adversity. Be ye strong therefore," saith he to the reformers of that age, "and let not your hands be weak, for your work shall be rewarded." And in those prophets that liv'd in the times of reformation after the captivity, often doth God stir up the people to consider that while establishment of Church-matters was neglected, and put off, there "was no peace to him that went out or came in; for I," saith God, "had set all men every one against his neighbour." But from the very day forward that they went seriously and effectually about the welfare of the Church, he tells them that they themselves might perceive the sudden change of things into a prosperous and peaceful condition. But it will here be said that the reformation is a long work, and the miseries of Ireland are urgent of a speedy redress. They be indeed; and how speedy we are, the poor afflicted remnant of our martyr'd countrymen that sit there on the sea-shore, counting the hours of our delay with their sighs, and the minutes with their falling tears, perhaps with the distilling of their bloody wounds, if they have not quite by this time cast off, and almost curst the vain hope of our founder'd ships and aids, can best judge how speedy we are to their relief. But let their succours be hastened, as all need and reason is; and let not therefore the reformation, which is the chiefest cause of success and victory, be still procrastinated. They of the captivity in their greatest extremities could find both counsel and hands enough at once to build, and to expect the enemies assault. And we for our parts, a populous and mighty nation, must needs be fallen into a strange plight either of effeminacy or confusion, if Ireland that was once the conquest of one single earl with his private forces, and the small assistance of a petty Kernish prince, should now take up all the wisdom and prowess of this potent monarchy, to quell a barbarous crew of rebels, whom if we take but the right course to subdue, that is, beginning at the reformation of our Church, their own horrid murders and rapes will so fight against them, that the very sutlers and horse-boys of the camp will be able to rout and chase them without the staining of any noble sword. To proceed by other method in this enterprize, be our captains and commanders never so expert, will be as great an error in the art of war, as any novice in soldiership ever committed. And thus I leave it as a declared truth, that neither the fear of sects, nor rebellion, can be a fit plea to stay reformation, but rather to push it forward with all possible diligence and speed.

The SECOND BOOK.

HOW happy were it for this frail, and as it may be truly call'd, mortal life of man, since all earthly things which have the name of good and convenient in our daily use, are withal so cumbersome and full of trouble, if knowledge, yet which is the best and lightfomest possession of the mind, were, as the common saying is, no burden; and that what it wanted of being a load to any part of the body, it did not with a heavy advantage overlay upon the spirit? For not to speak of that knowledge that rests in the contemplation of natural causes and dimensions, which must needs be a lower wisdom, as the object is low, certain it is, that he who hath obtained in more than the scantiest measure to know any thing distinctly of God, and of his true worship, and what is infallibly good and happy in the state of man's life, what in itself evil and miserable, though vulgarly not so esteem'd; he that hath obtain'd to know this, the only high valuable wisdom indeed, remembring also that God even to a strictness requires the improvement of these his entrusted gifts, cannot but sustain a forer burden of mind, and more pressing than any supportable toil or weight which the body can labour under: how and in what manner he shall dispose and employ those sums of knowledge and illumination which God hath sent him into this world to trade with. And that which aggravates the burden more, is, that having receiv'd amongst his allotted parcels, certain precious truths of such an orient lustre as no diamond can equal; which nevertheless he has in charge to put off at any cheap rate, yea, for nothing to them that will; the great merchants of this world fearing that this course would soon discover, and disgrace the false glitter of their deceitful wares wherewith they abuse the people, like poor Indians with beads and glasses, practise by all means how they may suppress the vending of such rarities, and at such a cheapness as would undo them, and turn their trash upon their hands. Therefore by gratifying the corrupt desires of men in fleshly doctrines, they stir them up to persecute with hatred and contempt all those that seek to bear themselves uprightly in this their spiritual factory: which they foreseeing, though they cannot but testify of truth, and the excellency of that heavenly traffick which they bring, against what opposition or danger soever, yet needs must it sit heavily upon their spirits, that being in God's prime intention and their own, selected heralds of peace, and dispensers of treasure inestimable, without price to them that have no pence, they find in the discharge of their commission, that they are made the greatest variance and offence, a very sword and fire both in house and city over the whole earth. This is that which the sad prophet Jeremiah laments, "Wo is me my mother, that thou hast born me a man of strife and contention!" And although divine inspiration must certainly have been sweet to those ancient prophets, yet the irksomness of that truth which they brought, was so unpleasant unto them, that every where they call it a burden. Yea, that mysterious book of Revelation, which the great evangelist was bid to eat, as it had been some eye-brightning electuary of knowledge and foresight, though it were sweet in his mouth, and in the learning, it was bitter in his belly, bitter in the denouncing. Nor was this hid from the wise poet Sophocles, who in that place of his tragedy, where Tiresias is call'd to resolve king Œdipus in a matter which he knew would be grievous, brings him in bemoaning his lot, that he knew more than other men. For surely to every good and peaceable man, it must in nature needs be a hateful thing to be the displeaser and molester of thousands; much better would it like him doubtless to be the messenger of gladness and contentment, which is his chief intended business to all mankind, but that they resist and oppose their own true happiness. But when God commands to take the trumpet, and blow a dolorous or a jarring blast, in lies not in man's will what he shall say, or what he shall conceal. If he shall think to be silent, as Jeremiah did, be-
cause

cause of the reproach and derision he met with daily, "and all his familiar friends watch'd for his halting," to be reveng'd on him for speaking the truth, he would be forc'd to confess as he confest; "his word was in my heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones; I was weary with forbearing, and could not stay." Which might teach these times not suddenly to condemn all things that are sharply spoken, or vehemently written, as proceeding out of stomach, virulence, and ill-nature; but to consider rather that if the prelates have leave to say the worst that can be said, or do the worst that can be done, while they strive to keep to themselves, to their great pleasure and commodity, those things which they ought to render up, no man can be justly offended with him that shall endeavour to impart and bestow, without any gain to himself, those sharp but saving words, which would be a terror and a torment in him to keep back. For me, I have determined to lay up as the best treasure, and solace of a good old age, if God vouchsafe it me, the honest liberty of free speech from my youth, where I shall think it available in so dear a concernment as the Church's good. For if I be either by disposition, or what other cause, too inquisitive, or suspicious of myself and mine own doings, who can help it? But this I foresee, that should the Church be brought under heavy oppression, and God have given me ability the while to reason against that man that should be the author of so foul a deed; or should she, by blessing from above on the industry and courage of faithful men, change this her distracted estate into better days, without the least furtherance or contribution of those few talents which God at that present had lent me; I foresee what stories I should hear within myself, all my life after, of discourage and reproach. Timorous and ingrateful, the Church of God is now again at the foot of her insulting enemies, and thou bewailest; what matters it for thee, or thy bewailing? When time was, thou could'st not find a syllable of all that thou hast read, or studied, to utter in her behalf. Yet ease and leisure was given thee for thy retired thoughts, out of the sweat of other men. Thou hadst the diligence, the parts, the language of a man, if a vain subject were to be adorn'd or beautify'd; but when the cause of God and his Church was to be pleaded, for which purpose that tongue was given thee which thou hast, God listned if he could hear thy voice among his zealous servants, but thou wert dumb as a beast; from henceforward be that which thine own brutish silence hath made thee. Or else I should have heard on the other ear; slothful, and ever to be set light by, the Church hath now overcome her late distresses after the unwearied labours of many her true servants that stood up in her defence; thou also wouldst take upon thee to share amongst them of their joy: But wherefore thou? Where canst thou shew any word or deed of thine which might have hasten'd her peace? Whatever thou dost now talk, or write, or look, is the alms of other men's active prudence and zeal. Dare not now to say, or do any thing better than thy former sloth and infancy; or if thou dar'st, thou dost impudently to make a thrifty purchase of boldness to thyself, out of the painful merits of other Men; what before was thy sin, is now thy duty, to be abject and worthless. These, and such like lessons as these, I know would have been my matins duly, and my even-song. But now by this little diligence, mark what a privilege I have gain'd with good men and saints, to claim my right of lamenting the tribulations of the Church, if she should suffer, when others that have ventur'd nothing for her sake, have not the honour to be admitted mourners. But if she lift up her drooping head and prosper, among those that have something more than wish'd her welfare, I have my charter and freehold of rejoicing to me and my heirs. Concerning therefore this wayward subject against Prelaty, the touching whereof is so distasteful and disquietous to a number of men, as by what hath been said I may deserve of charitable readers to be credited, that neither envy nor gall hath entred me upon this controversy, but the enforcement of conscience only, and a preventive fear lest the omitting of this duty should be against me when I would store up to myself the good provision of peaceful hours: So lest it should be still imputed to me, as I have found it hath been, that
some

some self-pleasing humour of vain-glory hath incited me to contest with men of high estimation, now while green years are upon my head; from this needless surmifal I shall hope to dissuade the intelligent and equal auditor, if I can but say successfully that which in this exigent behoves me; although I would be heard only, if it might be, by the elegant and learned reader, to whom principally for a while I shall beg leave I may address myself. To him it will be no new thing, though I tell him that if I hunted after praise, by the ostentation of wit and learning, I should not write thus out of mine own season, when I have neither yet compleated to my mind the full circle of my private studies, although I complain not of any insufficiency to the matter in hand; or were I ready to my wishes, it were a folly to commit any thing elaborately compos'd to the careless and interrupted listening of these tumultuous times. Next, if I were wise only to my own ends, I would certainly take such a subject as of itself might catch applause, whereas this hath all the disadvantages on the contrary, and such a subject as the publishing whereof might be delay'd at pleasure, and time enough to pencil it over with all the curious touches of art, even to the perfection of a faultless picture; whenas in this argument the not deferring is of great moment to the good speeding, that if solidity have leisure to do her office, art cannot have much. Lastly, I should not chuse this manner of writing, wherein knowing myself inferior to myself, led by the genial power of Nature to another task, I have the use, as I may account, but of my left hand. And though I shall be foolish in saying more to this purpose, yet since it will be such a folly, as wisest men go about to commit, having only confess'd and so committed, I may trust with more reason, because with more folly, to have courteous pardon. For although a poet, soaring in the high region of his fancies, with his garland and singing robes about him, might, without apology, speak more of himself than I mean to do; yet for me fitting here below in the cool element of prose, a mortal thing among many readers of no empyreal conceit, to venture and divulge unusual things of myself, I shall petition to the gentler sort, it may not be envy to me. I must say therefore, that after I had for my first years, by the ceaseless diligence and care of my father, (whom God recompence!) been exercis'd to the tongues, and some sciences, as my age would suffer, by sundry masters and teachers both at home and at the Schools, it was found, that whether ought was impos'd me by them that had the over-looking, or betaken to of mine own choice in English, or other tongue, prosing or versing, but chiefly this latter, the stile by certain vital signs it had, was likely to live. But much latelier in the private academies of Italy, whither I was favour'd to resort, perceiving that some trifles which I had in memory, compos'd at under twenty or thereabout, (for the manner is, that every one must give some proof of his wit and reading there) met with acceptance above what was look'd for; and other things which I had shifted in scarcity of books and conveniences to patch up amongst them, were receiv'd with written encomiums, which the Italian is not forward to bestow on men of this side the Alps; I began thus far to assent both to them and divers of my friends here at home, and not less to an inward prompting which now grew daily upon me, that by labour and intent study, (which I take to be my portion in this life) join'd with the strong propensity of nature, I might perhaps leave something so written to after times, as they should not willingly let it die. These thoughts at once possessed me, and these other; that if I were certain to write as men buy leases, for three lives and downward, there ought no regard be sooner had than to God's glory, by the honour and instruction of my country. For which cause, and not only for that I knew it would be hard to arrive at the second rank among the Latins, I apply'd myself to that resolution which Ariosto follow'd against the persuasions of Bembo, to fix all the industry and art I could unite to the adorning of my native tongue; not to make verbal curiosities the end, (that were a toilsome vanity,) but to be an interpreter and relater of the best and sagest things among mine own citizens throughout this island in the mother dialect. That what the greatest and choicest wits
of

of Athens, Rome, or modern Italy, and those Hebrews of old did for their country, I, in my proportion, with this over and above, of being a christian, might do for mine; not caring to be once nam'd abroad, though perhaps I could attain to that, but content with these British islands as my world; whose fortune hath hitherto been, that if the Athenians, as some say, made their small deeds great and renowned by their eloquent writers, England hath had her noble achievements made small by the unskillful handling of monks and mechanics.

Time serves not now, and perhaps I might seem too profuse to give any certain account of what the mind at home, in the spacious circuits of her musing, hath liberty to propose to herself, though of highest hope, and hardest attempting; whether that epic form whereof the two poems of Homer, and those other two of Virgil and Tasso are a diffuse, and the book of Job a brief model: or whether the rules of Aristotle herein are strictly to be kept, or nature to be follow'd, which in them that know art, and use judgment, is no transgression, but an enriching of art: And lastly, what king or knight before the conquest, might be chosen in whom to lay the pattern of a Christian Hero. And as Tasso gave to a Prince of Italy his choice, whether he would command him to write of Godfrey's expedition against the Infidels, or Belisarius against the Goths, or Charlemain against the Lombards; if to the instinct of Nature and the imboldning of art aught may be trusted, and that there be nothing adverse in our climate, or the fate of this age, it haply would be no rashness from an equal diligence and inclination, to present the like offer in our own ancient stories: Or whether those dramatic constitutions, wherein Sophocles and Euripides reign, shall be found more doctrinal and exemplary to a nation. The Scripture also affords us a divine pastoral drama in the song of Solomon, consisting of two persons, and a double chorus, as Origen rightly judges. And the Apocalypse of saint John is the majestic image of a high and stately tragedy, shutting up and intermingling her solemn scenes and acts with a sevenfold chorus of hallelujah's and harping symphonies: and this my opinion the grave authority of Pareus, commenting that book, is sufficient to confirm. Or if occasion shall lead, to imitate those magnificent odes and hymns wherein Pindarus and Callimachus are in most things worthy, some others in their frame judicious, in their matter most an end faulty. But those frequent songs throughout the Law and Prophets beyond all these, not in their divine argument alone, but in the very critical art of composition, may be easily made appear over all the kinds of lyric poesy, to be incomparable. These abilities, wheresoever they be found, are the inspired gift of God rarely bestow'd, but yet to some (though most abuse) in every nation: and are of power, beside the office of a pulpit, to inbreed and cherish in a great people the seeds of virtue, and public civility, to allay the perturbations of the mind, and set the affections in right tune; to celebrate in glorious and lofty hymns the throne and equipage of God's Almightyness, and what he works, and what he suffers to be wrought with high providence in his Church; to sing victorious agonies of Martyrs and Saints, the deeds and triumphs of just and pious nations, doing valiantly through faith against the enemies of Christ; to deplore the general relapses of kingdoms and states from justice and God's true worship. Lastly, whatsoever in religion is holy and sublime, in virtue amiable or grave, whatsoever hath passion or admiration in all the changes of that which is called fortune from without, or the wily subtleties and reflexes of man's thoughts from within; all these things with a solid and treatable smoothness to paint out and describe. Teaching over the whole book of sanctity and virtue, through all the instances of example, with such delight to those especially of soft and delicious temper, who will not so much as look upon truth herself, unless they see her elegantly drest; that whereas the paths of honesty and good life appear now rugged and difficult, though they be indeed easy and pleasant, they will then appear to all men both easy and pleasant, though they were rugged and difficult indeed. And what a benefit this would be to our youth and gentry, may be soon guessed by what we know of the corruption and bane which they suck in daily from the writings

writings and interludes of libidinous and ignorant poetasters, who having scarce ever heard of that which is the main consistence of a true poem, the choice of such persons as they ought to introduce, and what is moral and decent to each one; do for the most part lay up vicious principles in sweet pills to be swallowed down, and make the taste of virtuous documents harsh and sour. But because the spirit of man cannot demean itself lively in this body, without some recreating intermission of labour, and serious things, it were happy for the commonwealth, if our magistrates, as in those famous governments of old, would take into their care, not only the deciding of our contentious law-cases and brawls, but the managing of our publick sports and festival pastimes, that they might be, not such as were authorized a while since, the provocations of drunkenness and lust, but such as may inure and harden our bodies by martial exercises to all war like skill and performance; and may civilize, adorn, and make discreet our minds by the learned and affable meeting of frequent academies, and the procurement of wise and artful recitations, sweetened with eloquent and graceful inticements to the love and practice of justice, temperance, and fortitude, instructing and bettering the nation at all opportunities, that the call of wisdom and virtue may be heard every where, as Solomon saith; "She crieth without, she uttereth her voice in the streets, in the top of high places, in the chief concourse, and in the openings of the gates." Whether this may not be, not only in pulpits, but after another persuasive method, at set and solemn paneguries, in theatres, porches, or what other place or way, may win most upon the people to receive at once both recreation, and instruction; let them in authority consult. The thing which I had to say, and those intentions which have lived within me ever since I could conceive myself any thing worth to my country, I return to crave excuse that urgent reason hath pluckt from me, by an abortive and fore dated discovery. And the accomplishment of them lies not but in a power above man's to promise; but that none hath by more studious ways endeavoured, and with more unwearied spirit that none shall, that I dare almost aver of myself, as far as life and free leisure will extend; and that the land had once enfranchised herself from this impertinent yoke of prelaty, under whose inquisitorious and tyrannical duncery, no free and splendid wit can flourish. Neither do I think it shame to covenant with any knowing reader, that for some few years yet I may go on trust with him toward the payment of what I am now indebted, as being a work not to be raised from the heat of youth, or the vapours of wine; like that which flows at waste from the pen of some vulgar amourist, or the trencher fury of a riming parasite; nor to be obtained by the invocation of Dame Memory and her Siren daughters, but by devout prayer to that eternal spirit, who can enrich with all utterance and knowledge, and sends out his seraphim, with the hallow'd fire of his altar, to touch and purify the lips of whom he pleases: to this must be added industrious and select reading, steady observation, insight into all seemly and generous arts and affairs; till which in some measure be compassed, at mine own peril and cost, I refuse not to sustain this expectation from as many as are not loth to hazard so much credulity upon the best pledges that I can give them. Although it nothing content me to have disclosed thus much before hand, but that I trust hereby to make it manifest with what small willingness I endure to interrupt the pursuit of no less hopes than these, and leave a calm and pleasing solitariness, fed with chearful and confident thoughts, to imbark in a troubled sea of noises and hoarse disputes, put from beholding the bright countenance of truth in the quiet and still air of delightful studies, to come into the dim reflection of hollow antiquities sold by the seeming bulk, and there be fain to club quotations with men whose learning and belief lies in marginal stuffings; who when they have, like good sumpters, laid ye down their horse-load of citations and fathers at your door, with a rhapsody of who and who were bishops here or there, ye may take off their packsaddles, their day's work is done, and episcopacy, as they think, stoutly vindicated. Let any gentle apprehension that can distinguish learned pains from unlearned drudgery, imagine what pleasure or profoundness can be in this, or what honour to deal against such adversaries. But were it the meanest under-service, if
God

God by his secretary Conscience enjoin it, it were sad for me if I should draw back; for me especially, now when all men offer their aid to help ease and lighten the difficult labours of the church, to whose service, by the intentions of my parents and friends I was destined of a child, and in mine own resolutions: till coming to some maturity of years, and perceiving what tyranny had invaded the church, that he who would take orders must subscribe slave, and take an oath withal, which unless he took with a conscience that would retch, he must either strait perjure, or split his faith; I thought it better to prefer a blameless silence before the sacred office of speaking, bought and begun with servitude and forswearing. Howsoever thus church-outed by the prelates, hence may appear the right I have to meddle in these matters, as before the necessity and constraint appeared.

C H A P. I.

That Prelaty opposeth the reason and end of the gospel three ways,
and first in her outward form.

AFTER this digression, it would remain that I should single out some other reason which might undertake for prelaty to be a fit and lawful church-government; but finding none of like validity with these that have already sped according to their fortune, I shall add one reason why it is not to be thought a church-government at all, but a church-tyranny, and is at hostile terms with the end and reason of Christ's evangelic ministry. Albeit I must confess to be half in doubt whether I should bring it forth or no, it being so contrary to the eye of the world, and the world so potent in most men's hearts, that I shall endanger either not to be regarded, or not to be understood: for who is there almost that measures wisdom by simplicity, strength by suffering, dignity by lowliness? who is there that counts it first to be last, something to be nothing, and reckons himself of great command in that he is a servant? yet God when he meant to subdue the world and hell at once, part of that to salvation, and this wholly to perdition, made choice of no other weapons, or auxiliaries than these, whether to save or to destroy. It had been a small mastery for him to have drawn out his legions into array, and flanked them with his thunder; therefore he sent foolishness to confute wisdom, weakness to bind strength, despisedness to vanquish pride: and this is the great mystery of the gospel made good in Christ himself, who as he testifies came not to be ministred to, but to minister; and must be fulfilled in all his ministers till his second coming. To go against these principles St. Paul so feared, that if he should but affect the wisdom of words in his preaching, he thought it would be laid to his charge, that he had made the cross of Christ to be of none effect. Whether then prelaty do not make of none effect the cross of Christ, by the principles it hath so contrary to these, nullifying the power and end of the gospel, it shall not want due proof, if it want not due belief. Neither shall I stand to trifle with one that will tell me of quiddities and formalities, whether prelaty or prelateity in abstract notion be this or that; it suffices me that I find it in his skin, so I find it inseparable, or not oftner otherwise than a phoenix hath been seen; although I persuade me that whatever faultiness was but superficial to prelaty at the beginning, is now by the just judgment of God, long since branded and inworn into the very essence thereof. First therefore, if to do the work of the gospel, Christ our Lord took upon him the form of a servant; how can his servant in this ministry take upon him the form of a lord? I know Bilson hath decyphered us all the galanteries of Signore and Monsignore, and Monsieur, as circumstantially as any punctualist of Castile, Naples, or Fountain-Bleau could have done: but this must not so compliment us out of our right minds, as to be to learn that the form of a servant was a mean, laborious, and vulgar life aptest to teach; which form Christ thought fittest, that he might bring about his will according

according to his own principles, chusing the meaner things of this world, that he might put under the high. Now whether the pompous garb, the lordly life, the wealth, the haughty distance of prelacy be those meaner things of the world, whereby God in them would manage the mystery of his gospel, be it the verdict of common sense. For Christ saith in St. John, "The servant is not greater than his Lord, nor he that is sent greater than he that sent him;" and adds, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." Then let the prelates well advise, if they neither know, nor do these things, or if they know, and yet do them not, wherein their happiness consists. And thus is the gospel frustrated by the lordly form of prelacy.

CHAP. II.

That the ceremonious doctrine of prelacy opposeth the reason and end of the gospel.

THAT which next declares the heavenly power, and reveals the deep mystery of the gospel, is the pure simplicity of doctrine, accounted the foolishness of this world, yet crossing and confounding the pride and wisdom of the flesh. And wherein consists this fleshly wisdom and pride? in being altogether ignorant of God and his worship? No surely, for men are naturally ashamed of that. Where then? It consists in a bold presumption of ordering the worship and service of God after man's own will in traditions and ceremonies. Now if the pride and wisdom of the flesh were to be defeated and confounded, no doubt but in that very point wherein it was proudest, and thought itself wisest, that so the victory of the gospel might be the more illustrious. But our prelates, instead of expressing the spiritual power of their ministry, by warring against this chief bulwark and strong-hold of the flesh, have enter'd into fast league with the principal enemy against whom they were sent, and turned the strength of fleshly pride and wisdom against the pure simplicity of saving truth. First, mistrusting to find the authority of their order in the immediate institution of Christ, or his apostles, by the clear evidence of scripture, they fly to the carnal supportment of tradition; when we appeal to the Bible, they to the unwieldy volumes of tradition: and do not shame to reject the ordinance of him that is eternal, for the perverse iniquity of sixteen hundred years; chusing rather to think truth itself a liar, than that sixteen ages should be taxed with an error; not considering the general apostasy that was foretold, and the church's flight into the wilderness. Nor is this enough; instead of shewing the reason of their lowly condition from divine example and command, they seek to prove their high pre-eminence from human consent and authority. But let them chaunt while they will of prerogatives, we shall tell them of scripture; of custom, we of scripture; of acts and statutes, still of scripture; till the quick and piercing word enter to the dividing of their souls, and the mighty weakness of the gospel throw down the weak mightiness of man's reasoning. Now for their demeanour within the church, how have they disfigured and defaced that more than angelick brightness, the unclouded serenity of christian religion, with the dark overcasting of superstitious copes and flaminical vestures, wearing on their backs, and I abhor to think, perhaps in some worse place, the unexpressible image of God the Father? Tell me, ye priests, wherefore this gold, wherefore these robes and surplices over the gospel? Is our religion guilty of the first trespass, and hath need of cloathing to cover her nakedness? What does this else but cast an ignominy upon the perfection of Christ's ministry, by seeking to adorn it with that which was the poor remedy of our shame? Believe it, wondrous doctors, all corporeal resemblances of inward holiness and beauty are now past; he that will cloath the gospel now, intimates plainly, that the gospel is naked, uncomely, that I may not say reproachful.

proachful. Do not, ye church-maskers, while Christ is cloathing upon our barrenness with his righteous garment, to make us acceptable in his Father's sight; do not, as ye do, cover and hide his righteous verity with the polluted clothing of your ceremonies, to make it seem more decent in your own eyes. "How beautiful," saith Isaiah, "are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth salvation!" Are the feet so beautiful, and is the very bringing of these tidings so decent of itself? What new decency can then be added to this by your spinstery? Ye think by these gaudy glisterings to stir up the devotion of the rude multitude; ye think so, because ye forsake the heavenly teaching of St. Paul for the hellish sophistry of papism. If the multitude be rude, the lips of the preacher must give knowledge, and not ceremonies. And although some Christians be new-born babes comparatively to some that are stronger, yet in respect of ceremony, which is but a rudiment of the law, the weakest Christian hath thrown off the robes of his minority, and is a perfect man, as to legal rites. What children's food there is in the gospel, we know to be no other than the "sincerity of the Word, that they may grow thereby." But is here the utmost of your out-braving the service of God? No. Ye have been bold, not to set your threshold by his threshold, or your posts by his posts; but your sacrament, your sign, call it what you will, by his sacrament, baptizing the christian infant with a solemn sprinkle, and unbaptizing for your own part with a prophane and impious fore-finger: as if when ye had laid the purifying element upon his forehead, ye meant to cancel and cross it out again with a character not of God's bidding. O but the innocence of these ceremonies! O rather the sottish absurdity of this excuse. What could be more innocent than the washing of a cup, a glass, or hands before meat, and that under the law when so many washings were commanded, and by long tradition? yet our Saviour detested their customs, though never so seeming harmless, and charges them severely that they had transgressed the commandments of God by their traditions, and worship'd him in vain. How much more then must these, and much grosser ceremonies now in force, delude the end of Christ's coming in the flesh against the flesh, and stifle the sincerity of our new covenant, which hath bound us to forsake all carnal pride and wisdom, especially in matters of religion? Thus we see again how Prelaty, failing in opposition to the main end and power of the gospel, doth not join in that mysterious work of Christ, by lowliness to confound height, by simplicity of doctrine the wisdom of the world, but contrariwise hath made itself high in the world and the flesh, to vanquish things by the world accounted low, and made itself wise in tradition and fleshly ceremony, to confound the purity of doctrine which is the wisdom of God.

C H A P. III.

That Prelatical Jurisdiction opposeth the reason and end of the Gospel and of State.

THE third and last consideration remains, whether the Prelates in their function do work according to the gospel, practising to subdue the mighty things of this world by things weak, which St. Paul hath set forth to be the power and excellence of the gospel; or whether in more likelihood they band themselves with the prevalent things of this world, to over-run the weak things which Christ hath made choice to work by: and this will soonest be discern'd by the course of their jurisdiction. But here again I find my thoughts almost in suspense betwixt yea and no, and am nigh turning mine eye which way I may best retire, and not proceed in this subject, blaming the ardency of my mind that fix'd me too attentively to come thus far. For truth I know not how, hath this unhappiness fatal to her, ere she can come to the trial and inspection of the understand-

ing; being to pass through many little wards and limits of the several affections and desires, she cannot shift it, but must put on such colours and attire, as those pathetic handmaids of the soul please to lead her in to their queen: And if she find so much favour with them, they let her pass in her own likeness; if not, they bring her into the presence habited and colour'd like a notorious falsehood. And contrary, when any falsehood comes that way, if they like the errand she brings, they are so artful to counterfeit the very shape and visage of truth, that the understanding not being able to discern the fucus which these inchantresses with such cunning have laid upon the feature sometimes of truth, sometimes of falsehood interchangeably, sentences for the most part one for the other at the first blush, according to the subtle imposture of these sensual mistresses that keep the ports and passages between her and the object. So that were it not for leaving imperfect that which is already said, I should go near to relinquish that which is to follow. And because I see that most men, as it happens in this world, either weakly or falsely principled, what through ignorance, and what through custom of licence, both in discourse and writing, by what hath been of late written in vulgar, have not seem'd to attain the decision of this point: I shall likewise assay those wily arbitresses who in most men have, as was heard, the sole ushering of truth and falsehood between the sense and the soul, with what loyalty they will use me in conveying this truth to my understanding; the rather for that by as much acquaintance as I can obtain with them, I do not find them engag'd either one way or other. Concerning therefore ecclesiastical jurisdiction, I find still more controversy, who should administer it; than diligent enquiry made to learn what it is: for had the pains been taken to search out that, it had been long ago enroll'd to be nothing else but a pure tyrannical forgery of the Prelates; and that jurisdictional power in the Church there ought to be none at all. It cannot be conceiv'd that what men now call jurisdiction in the Church, should be other thing than a christian censorship; and therefore it is most commonly and truly nam'd ecclesiastical censure. Now if the Roman Censor, a civil function, to that severe assize of surveying and controlling the privatest and slickest manners of all men and all degrees, had no jurisdiction, no courts of plea, or inditement, no punitive force annex'd; whether it were that to this manner of correction the intanglement of suits was improper, or that the notice of those upright inquisitors extended to such the most covert and spiritous vices as would slip easily between the wider and more material grasp of the law; or that it stood more with the majesty of that office to have no other serjeants or maces about them but those invisible ones of terror and shame: Or lastly, were it their fear, lest the greatness of this authority and honour, arm'd with jurisdiction, might step with ease into a tyranny: In all these respects, with much more reason undoubtedly ought the censure of the Church be quite divested and disintail'd of all jurisdiction whatsoever. For if the course of judicature to a political censorship seem either too tedious, or too contentious, much more may it to the discipline of the Church, whose definitive decrees are to be speedy, but the execution of rigour slow, contrary to what in legal proceedings is most usual; and by how much the less contentious it is, by so much will it be the more Christian. And if the censor, in his moral episcopy, being to judge most in matters not answerable by writ or action, could not use an instrument so gross and bodily as jurisdiction is, how can the minister of the gospel manage the corpulent and secular trial of bill and process in things merely spiritual? Or could that Roman office, without this juridical sword or saw, strike such a reverence of itself into the most undaunted hearts, as with one single dash of ignominy to put all the senate and knighthood of Rome into a tremble? Surely much rather might the heavenly ministry of the evangel bind herself about with far more piercing beams of majesty and awe, by wanting the beggarly help of halings and amercements in the use of her powerful keys. For when the Church without temporal support is able to do her great works upon the unforc'd obedience of men, it argues a divinity about her. But when she thinks to credit and better her spiritual efficacy,

cacy, and to win herself respect and dread by strutting in the false vizard of worldly authority, 'tis evident that God is not there, but that her apostolic virtue is departed from her, and hath left her Key-cold: Which she perceiving as in a decay'd nature, seeks to the outward fomentations and chafings of worldly help, and external flourishes, to fetch, if it be possible, some motion into her extreme parts, or to hatch a counterfeit life with the crafty and artificial heat of jurisdiction. But it is observable, that so long as the Church, in true imitation of Christ, can be content to ride upon an ass, carrying herself and her government along in a mean and simple guise, she may be, as he is, a lion of the tribe of Juda; and in her humility all men with loud hosanna's will confess her greatness. But when despising the mighty operation of the spirit by the weak things of this world, she thinks to make herself bigger and more considerable, by using the way of civil force and jurisdiction, as she sits upon this lion she changes into an ass, and instead of hosanna's every man pelts her with stones and dirt. Lastly, if the wisdom of the Romans fear'd to commit jurisdiction to an office of so high esteem and dread as was the censors, we may see what a solecism in the art of policy it hath been all this while through Christendom to give jurisdiction to ecclesiastical censure. For that strength, join'd with religion, abus'd and pretended to ambitious ends, must of necessity breed the heaviest and most quelling tyranny not only upon the necks, but even to the souls of men: which if christian Rome had been so cautelous to prevent in her Church, as Pagan Rome was in her state, we had not had such a lamentable experience thereof as now we have from thence upon all christendom. For although I said before, that the Church coveting to ride upon the lionly form of jurisdiction, makes a transformation of herself into an ass, and becomes despicable, that is, to those whom God hath enlighten'd with true knowledge; but where they remain yet in the reliques of superstition, this is the extremity of their bondage and blindness, that while they think they do obeisance to the lordly vision of a lion, they do it to an ass, that through the just judgment of God is permitted to play the dragon among them because of their wilful stupidity. And let England here well rub her eyes, lest by leaving jurisdiction and Church-censure to the same persons, now that God hath been so long medicining her eye-sight, she do not with her over-politic fetches mar all, and bring herself back again to worship this ass bestriding a lion. Having hitherto explain'd, that to ecclesiastical censure no jurisdictional power can be added, without a childish and dangerous oversight in policy, and a pernicious contradiction in evangelic discipline, as anon more fully; it will be next to declare wherein the true reason and force of Church-censure consists, which by then it shall be laid open to the root; so little is it that I fear lest any crookedness, any wrinkle or spot should be found in presbyterian government, that if Bodin the famous French writer, though a papist, yet affirms that the commonwealth which maintains this discipline will certainly flourish in virtue and piety; I dare assure myself that every true protestant will admire the integrity, the uprightness, the divine and gracious purposes thereof, and even for the reason of it so coherent with the doctrine of the gospel, beside the evidence of command in scripture, will confess it to be the only true Church-government; and that contrary to the whole end and mystery of Christ's coming in the flesh, a false appearance of the same is exercis'd by Prelaty. But because some count it rigorous, and that hereby men shall be liable to a double punishment, I will begin somewhat higher, and speak of punishment. Which, as it is an evil, I esteem to be of two sorts, or rather two degrees only, a reprobate conscience in this life, and hell in the other world. Whatever else men call punishment or censure, is not properly an evil, so it be not an illegal violence, but a saving medicine ordain'd of God both for the public and private good of man; who consisting of two parts, the inward and the outward, was by the eternal Providence left under two sorts of cure, the church and the magistrate. The magistrate hath only to deal with the outward part, I mean not of the body alone, but of the mind in all her outward acts, which in scripture is call'd the outward man. So that it would be helpful to us if we might borrow
such.

such authority as the rhetoricians by patent may give us, with a kind of Promethean skill to shape and fashion this outward man into the similitude of a body, and set him visible before us; imagining the inner man only as the soul. Thus then the civil magistrate looking only upon the outward man, (I say as a magistrate, for what he doth further, he doth it as a member of the church) if he find in his complexion, skin, or outward temperature the signs and marks, or in his doings the effects of injustice, rapine, lust, cruelty, or the like, sometimes he shuts up as in frenetick or infectious diseases; or confines within doors, as in every sickly estate. Sometimes he shaves by penalty or mulct, or else to cool and take down those luxuriant humours which wealth and excess have caused to abound. Otherwhiles he sears, he cauterizes, he scarifies, lets blood; and finally, for utmost remedy cuts off. The patients, which most an end are brought into his hospital, are such as are far gone, and beside themselves, (unless they be falsely accus'd) so that force is necessary to tame and quiet them in their unruly fits, before they can be made capable of a more humane cure. His general end is the outward peace and welfare of the common-wealth, and civil happiness in this life. His particular end in every man is, by the infliction of pain, damage, and disgrace, that the senses and common perceivance might carry this message to the soul within, that it is neither easeful, profitable, nor praise-worthy in this life to do evil. Which must needs tend to the good of man, whether he be to live or die; and be undoubtedly the first means to a natural man, especially an offender, which might open his eyes to a higher consideration of good and evil, as it is taught in religion. This is seen in the often penitence of those that suffer, who, had they escap'd, had gone on sinning to an immeasurable heap, which is one of the extremest punishments. And this is all that the civil magistrate, as so being, confers to the healing of man's mind, working only by terrifying plaisters upon the rind and orifice of the fore; and by all outward appliances, as the logicians say, a posteriori, at the effect, and not from the cause; not once touching the inward bed of corruption, and that hectic disposition to evil, the source of all vice and obliquity against the rule of law. Which how insufficient it is to cure the soul of Man, we cannot better guess than by the art of bodily physic. Therefore God, to the intent of further healing man's depraved mind, to this power of the magistrate, which contents itself with the restraint of evil doing in the external man, added that which we call censure, to purge it and remove it clean out of the inmost soul. In the beginning this authority seems to have been plac'd, as all both civil and religious rites once were, only in each father of a family: Afterwards among the heathen, in the wise men and philosophers of the age; but so as it was a thing voluntary, and no set government. More distinctly among the Jews, as being God's peculiar, where the Priests, Levites, Prophets, and at last the Scribes and Pharisees took charge of instructing and overseeing the lives of the people. But in the Gospel, which is the straitest and the dearest covenant can be made between God and man, we being now his adopted sons, and nothing fitter for us to think on than to be like him, united to him, and, as he pleases to express it, to have fellowship with him; it is all necessity that we should expect this blessed efficacy of healing our inward man to be ministr'd to us in a more familiar and effectual method than ever before. God being now no more a judge after the sentence of the law, nor, as it were, a schoolmaster of perishable rites, but a most indulgent father, governing his Church as a family of sons in their discreet age: and therefore in the sweetest and mildest manner of paternal discipline, he hath committed this other office of preserving in healthful constitution the inner man, which may be term'd the spirit of the soul, to his spiritual deputy the minister of each congregation; who being best acquainted with his own flock, hath best reason to know all the secretest diseases likely to be there. And look by how much the internal man is more excellent and noble than the external, by so much is his cure more exactly, more thoroughly, and more particularly to be perform'd. For which cause the Holy Ghost by the Apostles join'd to the Minister, as assistant in this great office, sometimes

a certain number of grave and faithful brethren, (for neither doth the physician do all in restoring his patient, he prescribes, another prepares the medicine, some tend, some watch, some visit) much more may a minister partly not see all, partly err as a man: besides, that nothing can be more for the mutual honour and love of the people to their pastor, and his to them, than when in select numbers and courses they are seen partaking, and doing reverence to the holy duties of discipline by their serviceable and solemn presence, and receiving honour again from their employment, not now any more to be separated in the Church by vails and partitions as laics and unclean, but admitted to wait upon the tabernacle as the rightful clergy of Christ, a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifice in that meet place to which God and the congregation shall call and assign them. And this all Christians ought to know, that the title of Clergy St. Peter gave to all God's people, till Pope Higinus and the succeeding Prelates took it from them, appropriating that name to themselves and their priests only; and condemning the rest of God's inheritance to an injurious and alienate condition of laity, they separated from them by local partitions in Churches, through their gross ignorance and pride imitating the old temple, and excluding the members of Christ from the property of being members, the bearing of orderly and fit offices in the ecclesiastical body; as if they had meant to sew up that Jewish vail which Christ by his death on the cross rent in sunder. Although these usurpers could not so presently over-master the liberties and lawful titles of God's freeborn Church; but that Origen, being yet a lay-man, expounded the Scriptures publicly, and was therein defended by Alexander of Jerusalem, and Theoctistus of Cæsarea, producing in his behalf divers examples, that the privileges of teaching was anciently permitted to many worthy lay-men: And Cyprian in his epistles professes he will do nothing without the advice and assent of his assistant laics. Neither did the first Nicene council, as great and learned as it was, think it any robbery to receive in, and require the help and presence of many learned lay-brethren, as they were then call'd. Many other authorities to confirm this assertion, both out of Scripture and the writings of next antiquity, Golartius hath collected in his notes upon Cyprian; whereby it will be evident, that the laity, not only by apostolic permission, but by consent of many the ancientest Prelates, did participate in Church-offices as much as is desir'd any lay-elder should now do. Sometimes also not the elders alone, but the whole body of the Church is interested in the work of discipline, as oft as public satisfaction is given by those that have given public scandal. Not to speak now of her right in elections. But another reason there is in it, which though religion did not commend to us, yet moral and civil prudence could not but extol. It was thought of old in philosophy, that shame, or to call it better, the reverence of our elders, our brethren and friends, was the greatest incitement to virtuous deeds, and the greatest dissuasion from unworthy attempts that might be. Hence we may read in the Iliad, where Hector being wish'd to retire from the battel, many of his forces being routed, makes answer, that he durst not for shame, lest the Trojan knights and dames should think he did ignobly. And certain it is, that whereas terror is thought such a great stickler in a commonwealth, honourable shame is a far greater, and has more reason: for where shame is, there is fear; but where fear is, there is not presently shame. And if any thing may be done, to inbreed in us this generous and christianly reverence one of another, the very nurse and guardian of piety and virtue, it cannot sooner be than by such a discipline in the church, as may use us to have in awe the assemblies of the faithful, and to count it a thing most grievous, next to the grieving of God's spirit, to offend those whom he hath put in authority, as a healing superintendence over our lives and behaviours, both to our own happiness, and that we may not give offence to good men, who without amends by us made, dare not, against God's command, hold communion with us in holy things. And this will be accompanied with a religious dread of being out-cast from the company of saints, and from the fatherly protection of God in his Church, to consort with the devil and his angels.

angels. But there is yet a more ingenuous and noble degree of honest shame, or call it, if you will, an esteem, whereby men bear an inward reverence toward their own persons. And if the love of God, as a fire sent from heaven to be ever kept alive upon the altars of our hearts, be the first principle of all godly and virtuous actions in men, this pious and just honouring of ourselves is the second, and may be thought as the radical moisture and fountain-head, whence every laudable and worthy enterprize issues forth. And although I have given it the name of a liquid thing, yet is it not incontinent to bound itself, as humid things are, but hath in it a most restraining and powerful abstinence to start back, and glob itself upward from the mixture of any ungenerous and unbeseeming motion, or any soil wherewith it may peril to stain itself. Something I confess it is to be asham'd of evil doing in the presence of any; and to reverence the opinion and the countenance of a good man rather than a bad, fearing most in his sight to offend, goes so far as almost to be virtuous; yet this is but still the fear of infamy, and many such, when they find themselves alone, saving their reputation, will compound with other scruples, and come to a close treaty with their dearer vices in secret. But he that holds himself in reverence and due esteem, both for the dignity of God's image upon him, and for the price of his redemption, which he thinks is visibly mark'd upon his forehead, accounts himself both a fit person to do the noblest and godliest deeds, and much better worth than to deject and defile, with such a debasement, and such a pollution as sin is, himself so highly ransom'd and enobled to a new friendship and filial relation with God. Nor can he fear so much the offence and reproach of others, as he dreads and would blush at the reflection of his own severe and modest eye upon himself, if it should see him doing or imagining that which is sinful, though in the deepest secrecy. How shall a man know to do himself this right, how to perform this honourable duty of estimation and respect towards his own soul and body? which way will lead him best to this hill-top of sanctity and goodness, above which there is no higher ascent but to the love of God, which from this self-pious regard cannot be asunder? No better way doubtless, than to let him duly understand, that as he is call'd by the high calling of God, to be holy and pure, so is he by the same appointment ordain'd, and by the Church's call admitted to such offices of discipline in the Church, to which his own spiritual gifts, by the example of apostolic institution, have authoriz'd him. For we have learnt that the scornful term of Laic, the consecrating of temples, carpets, and table-cloaths, the railing in of a repugnant and contradictive mount Sinai in the Gospel, as if the touch of a lay-christian, who is nevertheless God's living temple, could prophane dead Judaism, the exclusion of Christ's people from the offices of holy discipline through the pride of a usurping clergy, causes the rest to have an unworthy and abject opinion of themselves, to approach to holy duties with a slavish fear, and to unholy doings with a familiar boldness. For seeing such a wide and terrible distance between religious things and themselves, and that in respect of a wooden table, and the perimeter of holy ground about it, a flagon pot, and a linen corporal, the priest esteems their lay-ships unhallow'd and unclean, they fear religion with such a fear as loves not, and think the purity of the Gospel too pure for them, and that any uncleanness is more suitable to their unconsecrated estate. But when every good christian thoroughly acquainted with all those glorious privileges of sanctification and adoption, which render him more sacred than any dedicated altar or element, shall be restor'd to his right in the Church, and not excluded from such place of spiritual government, as his christian abilities, and his approv'd good life in the eye and testimony of the Church shall prefer him to, this and nothing sooner will open his eyes to a wise and true valuation of himself; (which is so requisite and high a point of christianity,) and will stir him up to walk worthy the honourable and grave employment wherewith God and the Church hath dignify'd him; not fearing lest he should meet with some outward holy thing in religion, which his lay-touch or presence might profane; but lest some-

something unholy from within his own heart, should dishonour and prophane in himself that priestly unction and clergy-right whereto Christ hath entitled him. Then would the congregation of the Lord soon recover the true likeness and visage of what she is indeed, a holy generation, a royal priesthood, a saintly communion, the household and city of God. And this I hold to be another considerable reason why the functions of Church-government ought to be free and open to any Christian man, though never so laic, if his capacity, his faith and prudent demeanor, commend him. And this the Apostles warrant us to do. But the Prelates object, that this will bring prophaneness into the Church: to whom may be replied, that none have brought that in more than their own irreligious courses, nor more driven holiness out of living into lifeless things. For whereas God, who hath cleans'd every beast and creeping worm, would not suffer S. Peter to call them common or unclean, the prelate Bishops, in their printed orders hung up in Churches, have proclaim'd the best of creatures, mankind, so unpurify'd and contagious, that for him to lay his hat or his garment upon the chancel-table, they have defin'd it no less heinous, in express words, than to prophane the table of the Lord. And thus have they by their Canaanitish doctrine, (for that which was to the Jew but Jewish, is to the Christian no better than Canaanitish) thus have they made common and unclean, thus have they made prophane that nature which God hath not only cleans'd, but Christ also hath assum'd. And now that the equity and just reason is so perspicuous, why in ecclesiastic censure the assistance should be added of such, as whom not the vile odour of gain and fees (forbid it God, and blow it with a whirlwind out of our land) but charity, neighbourhood, and duty to Church-government hath call'd together, where could a wise man wish a more equal, gratuitous, and meek examination of any offence that he might happen to commit against christianity than here? Would he prefer those proud simoniacal courts? Thus therefore the minister assisted attends his heavenly and spiritual cure: where we shall see him both in the course of his proceeding, and first in the excellency of his end, from the magistrate far different, and not more different than excelling. His end is to recover all that is of man, both soul and body, to an everlasting health: and yet as for worldly happiness, which is the proper sphere wherein the magistrate cannot but confine his motion without a hideous exorbitancy from law, so little aims the minister, as his intended scope, to procure the much prosperity of this life, that oft-times he may have cause to wish much of it away, as a diet puffing up the soul with a slimy fleshiness, and weakning her principal organic parts. Two heads of evil he has to cope with, ignorance and malice. Against the former he provides the daily manna of incorruptible doctrine, not at those set meals only in public, but as oft as he shall know that each infirmity or constitution requires. Against the latter with all the branches thereof, not meddling with that restraining and styptic surgery which the law uses, not indeed against the malady, but against the eruptions, and outermost effects thereof; he on the contrary, beginning at the prime causes and roots of the disease, sends in those two divine ingredients of most cleansing power to the soul, admonition and reproof; besides which two there is no drug or antidote that can reach to purge the mind, and without which all other experiments are but vain, unless by accident. And he that will not let these pass into him, though he be the greatest king, as Plato affirms, must be thought to remain impure within, and unknowing of those things wherein his pureness and his knowledge should most appear. As soon therefore as it may be discern'd that the christian patient, by feeding elsewhere on meats not allowable, but of evil juice, hath disordered his diet, and spread an ill humour through his veins, immediately disposing to a sickness; the minister, as being much nearer both in eye and duty than the magistrate, speeds him betimes to overtake that diffus'd malignance with some gentle potion of admonishment; or if aught be obstructed, puts in his opening and discussive confections. This not succeeding after once or twice, or oftener, in the presence of two or three his faithful brethren appointed thereto, he advises him to be more careful of his dearest health, and

what it is that he so rashly hath let down into the divine vessel of his soul, God's temple. If this obtain not, he then, with the counsel of more assistants, who are informed of what diligence hath been already used, with more speedy remedies lays nearer siege to the entrenched causes of his distemper, not sparing such fervent and well-aim'd reproofs as may best give him to see the dangerous estate wherein he is. To this also his brethren and friends intreat, exhort, adjure; and all these endeavours, as there is hope left, are more or less repeated. But if neither the regard of himself, nor the reverence of his elders and friends prevail with him to leave his vicious appetite; then as the time urges, such engines of terror God hath given into the hand of his minister, as to search the tenderest angles of the heart: one while he shakes his stubbornness with rack-ing convulsions nigh despair, otherwhiles with deadly corrosives he gripes the very roots of his faulty liver to bring him to life through the entry of death. Hereto the whole church beseech him, beg of him, deplore him, pray for him. After all this performed with what patience and attendance is possible, and no relenting on his part, having done the utmost of their cure, in the name of God and of the church they dissolve their fellowship with him, and holding forth the dreadful sponge of excommunication, pronounce him wiped out of the list of God's inheritance, and in the custody of Satan till he repent. Which horrid sentence, tho' it touch neither life nor limb, nor any worldly possession, yet has it such a penetrating force, that swifter than any chymical sulphur, or that lightning which harms not the skin, and rifles the entrails, it scorches the inmost soul. Yet even this terrible denouncement is left to the church for no other cause but to be as a rough and vehement cleansing medicine, where the malady is obdurate, a mortifying to life, a kind of saving by undoing. And it may be truly said, that as the mercies of wicked men are cruelties, so the cruelties of the church are mercies. For if repentance sent from heaven meet this lost wanderer, and draw him out of that steep journey wherein he was hasting towards destruction, to come and reconcile to the church, if he bring with him his bill of health, and that he is now clear of infection, and of no danger to the other sheep; then with incredible expressions of joy all his brethren receive him, and set before him those perfumed bankets of christian consolation; with precious ointments bathing and fomenting the old, and now to be forgotten stripes which terror and shame had inflicted; and thus with heavenly solaces they cheer up his humble remorse, till he regain his first health and felicity. This is the approved way which the gospel prescribes, these are the "spiritual weapons of holy censure, and ministerial warfare, not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds, casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." What could be done more for the healing and reclaiming that divine particle of God's breathing, the soul, and what could be done less? he that would hide his faults from such a wholesom curing as this, and count it a two-fold punishment, as some do, is like a man, that having foul diseases about him, perishes for shame, and the fear he has of a rigorous incision to come upon his flesh. We shall be able by this time to discern whether prelatical jurisdiction be contrary to the gospel or no. First therefore the government of the gospel being oeconomic and paternal, that is, of such a family where there be no servants, but all sons in obedience, not in servility, as cannot be denied by him that lives but within the sound of scripture; how can the prelates justify to have turned the fatherly orders of Christ's household, the blessed meekness of his lowly roof, those ever-open and inviting doors of his dwelling-house, which delight to be frequented with only filial accesses; how can they justify to have turned these domestic privileges into the bar of a proud judicial court, where fees and clamours keep shop and drive a trade, where bribery and corruption solicits, paltring the free and moneyless power of discipline with a carnal satisfaction by the purse? Contrition, humiliation, confession, the very sighs of a repentant spirit are there sold by the penny. That undeflowered and unblemishable simplicity of the gospel, not she herself, for that could never be, but a false-whited

whited, a lawny resemblance of her, like that air-born Helena in the fables, made by the forcery of prelates, instead of calling her disciples from the receipt of custom, is now turned publican herself; and gives up her body to a mercenary whoredom under those fornicated arches which she calls God's house, and in the sight of those her altars which she hath set up to be adored, makes merchandize of the bodies and souls of men. Rejecting purgatory for no other reason, as it seems, than because her greediness cannot defer, but had rather use the utmost extortion of redeemed penances in this life. But because these matters could not be thus carried without a begged and borrowed force from worldly authority, therefore prelaty slighting the deliberate and chosen counsel of Christ in his spiritual government, whose glory is in the weakness of fleshly things, to tread upon the crest of the world's pride and violence by the power of spiritual ordinances, hath on the contrary made these her friends and champions which are Christ's enemies in this his high design, smothering and extinguishing the spiritual force of his bodily weakness in the discipline of his church with the boistrous and carnal tyranny of an undue, unlawful, and ungospel-like jurisdiction. And thus prelaty both in her fleshly supportments, in her carnal doctrine of ceremony and tradition, in her violent and secular power, going quite counter to the prime end of Christ's coming in the flesh, that is, to reveal his truth, his glory, and his might, in a clean contrary manner than prelaty seeks to do, thwarting and defeating the great mystery of God; I do not conclude that prelaty is antichristian, for what need I? the things themselves conclude it. Yet if such like practices, and not many worse than these of our prelates, in that great darkness of the Roman church, have not exempted both her and her present members from being judged to be antichristian in all orthodoxal esteem; I cannot think but that it is the absolute voice of truth and all her children to pronounce this prelaty, and these her dark deeds in the midst of this great light wherein we live, to be more Antichristian than Antichrist himself.

The C O N C L U S I O N.

The mischief that prelaty does in the state.

I ADD one thing more to those great ones that are so fond of prelaty: this is certain, that the gospel being the hidden might of Christ, as hath been heard, hath ever a victorious power joined with it, like him in the Revelation that went forth on the white horse with his bow and his crown conquering and to conquer. If we let the angel of the gospel ride on his own way, he does his proper business, conquering the high thoughts, and the proud reasonings of the flesh, and brings them under to give obedience to Christ with the salvation of many souls. But if ye turn him out of his road, and in a manner force him to express his irresistible power by a doctrine of carnal might, as prelaty is, he will use that fleshly strength which ye put into his hands to subdue your spirits by a servile and blind superstition; and that again shall hold such dominion over your captive minds, as returning with an insatiate greediness and force upon your worldly wealth and power, wherewith to deck and magnify herself, and her false worships, he shall spoil and havock your estates, disturb your ease, diminish your honour, inthrall your liberty under the swelling mood of a proud clergy, who will not serve or feed your souls with spiritual food; look not for it, they have not wherewithal, or if they had, it is not in their purpose. But when they have glutted their ingrateful bodies, at least if it be possible that those open sepulchres should ever be glutted, and when they have stuffed their idolish temples with the wastful pillage of your estates, will they yet have any compassion upon you, and that poor pittance which they have left you; will they be but so good to you as that ravisher was to his sister, when he had used her at his pleasure; will they but only hate ye, and so turn ye

loose? No, they will not, Lords and Commons, they will not favour ye so much. What will they do then in the name of God and saints, what will these man-haters yet with more despight and mischief do? I'll tell ye, or at least remember ye, for most of ye know it already. That they may want nothing to make them true merchants of Babylon, as they have done to your souls, they will sell your bodies, your wives, your children, your liberties, your parliaments, all these things; and if there be aught else dearer than these, they will sell at an out-cry in their pulpits to the arbitrary and illegal dispose of any one that may hereafter be called a king, whose mind shall serve him to listen to their bargain. And by their corrupt and servile doctrines boring our ears to an everlasting slavery, as they have done hitherto, so will they yet do their best to repeal and erase every line and clause of both our great charters. Nor is this only what they will do, but what they hold as the main reason and mystery of their advancement that they must do; be the prince never so just and equal to his subjects, yet such are their malicious and depraved eyes, that they so look on him, and so understand him, as if he required no other gratitude, or piece of service from them than this. And indeed they stand so opportunely for the disturbing or the destroying of a state, being a knot of creatures, whose dignities, means, and preferments have no foundation in the gospel, as they themselves acknowledge, but only in the prince's favour, and to continue so long to them, as by pleasing him they shall deserve: whence it must needs be they should bend all their intentions and services to no other ends but to his, that if it should happen that a tyrant (God turn such a scourge from us to our enemies) should come to grasp the scepter, here were his spear-men and his lances, here were his fire-locks ready, he should need no other Pretorian band nor Pensionary than these, if they could once with their perfidious preachments awe the people. For although the Prelates in time of Popery were sometimes friendly enough to Magna Charta, it was because they stood upon their own bottom, without their main dependance on the royal nod: but now being well acquainted that the protestant religion, if she will reform herself rightly by the scriptures, must undress them of all their gilded vanities, and reduce them as they were at first, to the lowly and equal order of Presbyters, they know it concerns them nearly to study the times more than the text, and to lift up their eyes to the hills of the court, from whence only comes their help; but if their pride grow weary of this crouching and observance, as ere long it would, and that yet their minds climb still to a higher ascent of worldly honour, this only refuge can remain to them, that they must of necessity contrive to bring themselves and us back again to the pope's supremacy; and this we see they had by fair degrees of late been doing. These be the two fair supporters between which the strength of prelacy is borne up, either of inducing tyranny, or of reducing popery. Hence also we may judge that prelacy is mere falshood. For the property of truth is, where she is publickly taught, to unyoke and set free the minds and spirits of a nation first from the thralldom of sin and superstition, after which all honest and legal freedom of civil life cannot be long absent; but prelacy, whom the tyrant custom begot a natural tyrant in religion, and in state the agent and minister of tyranny, seems to have had this fatal gift in her nativity, like another Midas, that whatsoever she should touch or come near either in ecclesial or political government, it should turn not to gold, though she for her part could wish it, but to the dross and scum of slavery, breeding and settling both in the bodies and the souls of all such as do not in time, with the sovereign treacle of sound doctrine, provide to fortify their hearts against her hierarchy. The service of God who is truth, her liturgy confesses to be perfect freedom; but her works and her opinions declare that the service of Prelaty is perfect slavery, and by consequence perfect falshood. Which makes me wonder much that many of the gentry, studious men, as I hear, should engage themselves to write, and speak publickly in her defence; but that I believe their honest and ingenuous natures coming to the universities to store themselves with good and solid learning, and there unfortunately fed with nothing else but the scragged and thorny lectures of monkish and miserable sophistry, were sent home again with such a scholastical bur in their throats, as hath stopp'd
and

and hinder'd all true and generous philosophy from entering, crack'd their voices for ever with metaphysical gargarisms, and hath made them admire a sort of formal outside men prelatically addicted, whose unchasten'd and unwrought minds were never yet initiated or subdu'd under the true lore of religion or moral virtue, which two are the best and greatest points of learning; but either slightly trained up in a kind of hypocritical and hackney course of literature to get their living by, and dazle the ignorant, or else fondly overstudied in useless controversies, except those which they use with all the specious and delusive subtlety they are able, to defend their prelatical Sparta; having a gospel and church-government set before their eyes, as a fair field wherein they might exercise the greatest virtues and the greatest deeds of christian authority, in mean fortunes and little furniture of this world; (which even the sage heathen writers, and those old Fabritii and Curii well knew to be a manner of working, than which nothing could liken a mortal man more to God, who delights most to work from within himself, and not by the heavy luggage of corporeal instruments,) they understand it not, and think no such matter, but admire and dote upon worldly riches and honours, with an easy and intemperate life, to the bane of Christianity: yea, they and their seminaries shame not to profess, to petition, and never leave pealing our ears, that unless we fat them like boars, and cram them as they list with wealth, with deanries and pluralities, with baronies and stately preferments, all learning and religion will go under foot. Which is such a shameless, such a bestial plea, and of that odious impudence in churchmen, who should be to us a pattern of temperance and frugal mediocrity, who should teach us to condemn this world, and the gaudy things thereof, according to the promise which they themselves require from us in baptism, that should the scripture stand by and be mute, there is not that sect of philosophers among the heathen so dissolute, no not Epicurus, nor Aristippus with all his Cyrenaic rout, but would shut his school-doors against such greasy sophisters; not any college of mountebanks, but would think scorn to discover in themselves with such a brazen forehead the outrageous desire of filthy lucre. Which the Prelates make so little conscience of, that they are ready to fight, and if it lay in their power, to massacre all good christians under the names of horrible schismatics, for only finding fault with their temporal dignities, their unconscionable wealth and revenues, their cruel authority over their brethren that labour in the word, while they snore in their luxurious excess: Openly proclaiming themselves now in the sight of all men, to be those which for a while they sought to cover under sheeps clothing, ravenous and savage wolves, threatening inroads and bloody incursions upon the flock of Christ, which they took upon them to feed, but now claim to devour as their prey. More like that huge dragon of Egypt, breathing out waste and desolation to the land, unless he were daily fatten'd with virgin's blood. Him our old patron St. George by his matchless valour slew, as the prelate of the garter that reads his collect can tell. And if our princes and knights will imitate the fame of that old champion, as by their order of knighthood solemnly taken, they vow, far be it that they should uphold and side with this English dragon; but rather to do as indeed their oath binds them, they should make it their knightly adventure to pursue and vanquish this mighty sail-wing'd monster that menaces to swallow up the land, unless her bottomless gorge may be satisfied with the blood of the king's daughter the Church; and may, as she was wont, fill her dark and infamous den with the bones of the saints. Nor will any one have reason to think this as too incredible or too tragical to be spoken of Prelaty, if he consider well from what a mass of slime and mud the slothful, the coverous and ambitious hopes of Church-promotions and fat bishopricks, she is bred up and nuzzled in, like a great Python from her youth, to prove the general poison both of doctrine and good discipline in the land. For certainly such hopes and such principles of earth as these wherein she welters from a young one, are the immediate generation both of a slavish and tyrannous life to follow, and a pestiferous contagion to the whole kingdom, till like that fen-born serpent she be

shot to death with the darts of the sun, the pure and powerful beams of God's word. And this may serve to describe to us in part, what Prelaty hath been, and what, if she stand, she is like to be towards the whole body of people in England. Now that it may appear how she is not such a kind of evil, as hath any good or use in it, which many evils have, but a distill'd quintessence, a pure elixir of mischief, pestilent alike to all; I shall shew briefly, ere I conclude, that the prelates, as they are to the subjects a calamity, so are they the greatest underminers and betrayers of the monarch, to whom they seem to be most favourable. I cannot better liken the state and person of a king than to that mighty Nazarite Sampson; who being disciplin'd from his birth in the precepts and the practice of temperance and sobriety, without the strong drink of injurious and excessive desires, grows up to a noble strength and perfection with those his illustrious and sunny locks, the laws, waving and curling about his god-like shoulders. And while he keeps them about him undiminish'd and unshorn, he may with the jaw-bone of an ass, that is, with the word of his meanest officer, suppress and put to confusion thousands of those that rise against his just power. But laying down his head among the strumpet flatteries of Prelates, while he sleeps and thinks no harm, they wickedly shaving off all those bright and weighty tresses of his laws, and just prerogatives, which were his ornament and strength, deliver him over to indirect and violent counsels, which, as those Philistines, put out the fair and far-sighted eyes of his natural discerning, and make him grind in the prison-house of their sinister ends and practices upon him: Till he, knowing this prelatical rasor to have bereft him of his wonted might, nourish again his puissant hair, the golden beams of law and right: and they sternly shook, thunder with ruin upon the heads of those his evil counsellors, but not without great affliction to himself. This is the sum of their loyal service to kings; yet these are the men that still cry, the king, the king, the lord's anointed. We grant it, and wonder how they came to light upon any thing so true; and wonder more, if kings be the Lord's anointed, how they dare thus oil over and besmear so holy an unction with the corrupt and putrid ointment of their base flatteries; which while they smooth the skin, strike inward and invenom the life-blood. What fidelity kings can expect from Prelates, both examples past, and our present experience of their doings at this day, whereon is grounded all that hath been said, may suffice to inform us. And if they be such clippers of regal power, and shavers of the laws, how they stand affected to the law-giving Parliament, yourselves, worthy peers and commons, can best testify; the current of whose glorious and immortal actions hath been only oppos'd by the obscure and pernicious designs of the Prelates, until their insolence broke out to such a bold affront, as hath justly immur'd their haughty looks within strong walls. Nor have they done any thing of late with more diligence, than to hinder or break the happy assembling of parliaments, however needful to repair the shattered and disjointed frame of the commonwealth; or if they cannot do this, to cross, to disfigure, and traduce all parliamentary proceedings. And this, if nothing else, plainly accuses them to be no lawful members of the house, if they thus perpetually mutiny against their own body. And though they pretend, like Salomon's harlot, that they have right thereto, by the same judgment that Salomon gave, it cannot belong to them, whenas it is not only their assent, but their endeavour continually to divide parliaments in twain; and not only by dividing, but by all other means to abolish and destroy the free use of them to all posterity. For the which, and for all their former misdeeds, whereof this book and many volumes more cannot contain the moiety, I shall move ye, lords, in the behalf I dare say of many thousand good christians, to let your justice and speedy sentence pass against this great malefactor Prelaty. And yet in the midst of rigour I would beseech ye to think of mercy; and such a mercy, (I fear I shall overshoot with a desire to save this falling prelaty,) such a mercy (if I may venture to say it) as may exceed that which for only ten righteous persons would have saved Sodom. Not that I dare advise ye to contend with God, whether he or you shall be

be more merciful, but in your wise esteems to ballance the offences of those peccant cities with these enormous riots of ungodly misrule that prelaty hath wrought both in the Church of Christ, and in the state of this kingdom. And if ye think ye may with a pious presumption strive to go beyond God in mercy, I shall not be one now that would dissuade ye. Though God for less than ten just persons would not spare Sodom, yet if you can find after due search, but only one good thing in Prelaty, either to religion or civil government, to king or parliament, to prince or people, to law, liberty, wealth, or learning, spare her, let her live, let her spread among ye, till with her shadow all your dignities and honours, and all the glory of the land be darken'd and obscur'd. But on the contrary, if she be found to be malignant, hostile, destructive to all these, as nothing can be surer, then let your severe and impartial doom imitate the divine vengeance; rain down your punishing force upon this godless and oppressing government: and bring such a dead sea of subversion upon her, that she may never in this land rise more to afflict the holy reformed Church, and the elect people of God.

ANIMADVERSIONS

UPON THE

Remonstrants Defence against SPECTYMNUUS.

The PREFACE.

ALTHOUGH it be a certain truth that they who undertake a religious cause need not care to be men-pleasers; yet because the satisfaction of tender and mild consciences is far different from that which is call'd men-pleasing; to satisfy such, I shall address myself in few words to give notice before-hand of something in this book, which to some men perhaps may seem offensive, that when I have render'd a lawful reason of what is done, I may trust to have sav'd the labour of defending or excusing hereafter. We all know that in private or personal injuries, yea in public sufferings for the cause of Christ, his rule and example teaches us to be so far from a readiness to speak evil, as not to answer the reviler in his language, though never so much provoked: yet in the detecting, and convincing of any notorious enemy to truth and his country's peace, especially that is conceited to have a voluble and smart fluence of tongue, and in the vain confidence of that, and out of a more tenacious cling to worldly respects, stands up for all the rest to justify a long usurpation and convicted Pseudepiscopacy of Prelates, with all their ceremonies, liturgies, and tyrannies which God and man are now ready to explode and hiss out of the land; I suppose, and more than suppose, it will be nothing disagreeing from christian meekness, to handle such a one in a rougher accent, and to send home his haughtiness well bespurred with his own holy-water. Nor to do thus are we unauthoritied either from the moral Precept of SALOMON, to answer him thereafter that prides him in his folly; nor from the example of Christ, and all his followers in all ages, who in the refuting of those that resisted sound doctrine, and by subtile dissimulations corrupted the minds of men, have wrought up their zealous souls into such vehemencies, as nothing could be more killingly spoken: for who can be a greater enemy to mankind, who a more dangerous deceiver, than he who defending a traditional corruption uses no common arts, but with a wily stratagem of yielding to the time a greater part of his cause, seeming to forego all that man's invention hath done therein, and driven from much of his hold in scripture; yet leaving it hanging by a twin'd thread, not from divine command, but from apostolical prudence or assent; as if he had the surety of some rolling trench, creeps up by this mean to his relinquish'd fortress of divine authority again, and still hovering between the confines of that which he dares not be openly, and that which he will not be sincerely, trains on the easy christian insensibly within the close ambushment of worst errors, and with a sly shuffle of counterfeit principles, chopping and changing till he have glean'd all the good ones out of their minds, leaves them at last, after a slight resemblance of sweeping and garnishing, under the sevenfold possession of a desperate stupidity? And therefore they that love the souls of men, which is the dearest love, and stirs up the noblest jealousy, when they meet with such collusion, cannot be blam'd though they be transported with the zeal of truth to a well heated fervency; especially

pecially, seeing they which thus offend against the souls of their brethren, do it with delight to their great gain, ease, and advancement in this world; but they that seek to discover and oppose their false trade of deceiving, do it not without a sad and unwilling anger, not without many hazards; but without all private and personal spleen, and without any thought of earthly reward, whenas this very course they take stops their hopes of ascending above a lowly and unenviable pitch in this life. And although in the serious uncasing of a grand imposture (for to deal plainly with you readers, prelaty is no better) there be mix'd here and there such a grim laughter, as may appear at the same time in an austere visage, it cannot be taxt of levity or insolence: for even this vein of laughing (as I could produce out of grave authors) hath oft-times a strong and sinewy force in teaching and confuting; nor can there be a more proper object of indignation and scorn together, than a false prophet taken in the greatest, dearest, and most dangerous cheat, the cheat of souls: in the disclosing whereof, if it be harmful to be angry, and withal to cast a lowring smile, when the properest object calls for both, it will be long enough ere any be able to say, why those two most rational faculties of human intellect, anger and laughter, were first seated in the breast of man. Thus much (readers) in favour of the softer-spirited Christian, for other exceptioners there was no thought taken. Only if it be asked, why this close and succinct manner of coping with the adversary was rather chosen, this was the reason chiefly, that the ingenuous reader, without further amusing himself in the labyrinth of controversial antiquity, may come to the speediest way to see the truth vindicated, and sophistry taken short at the first false bound. Next, that the remonstrant himself, as oft as he pleases to be frolick, and brave it with others, may find no gain of money, and may learn not to insult in so bad a cause. But now he begins.

S E C T. I.

Remonstrant. My single Remonstrance is encountered with a plural Adversary.

Answer. Did not your single remonstrance bring along with it a hot scent of your more than singular affection to spiritual pluralities, your singleness would be less suspected with all good Christians than it is.

Remonst. Their names, persons, qualities, numbers, I care not to know.

Answ. Their names are known to the all-knowing power above; and in the mean while doubtless they wreck not whether you or your Nomenclator know them or not.

Remonst. But could they say my name is Legion, for we are many?

Answ. Wherefore should you begin with the devil's name, descanting upon the number of your opponents? wherefore that conceit of Legion with a by-wipe? Was it because you would have men take notice how you esteem them, whom through all your book so bountifully you call your brethren? we had not thought that Legion could have furnished the Remonstrant with so many brethren.

Remonst. My cause, ye Gods, would bid me meet them undismay'd, &c.

Answ. Ere a foot further we must be content to hear a preambling boast of your valour, what a St. Dunstan you are to encounter Legions, either infernal or human.

Remonst. My cause, ye gods.

Answ. What gods? unless your belly, or the god of this world be he? Shew us any one point of your Remonstrance that does not more concern superiority, pride, ease, and the belly, than the truth and glory of God, or the salvation of souls.

Remonst. My cause, ye gods, would bid me meet them undismayed, and to say with holy David, "though an host, &c."

Answ. Do not think to persuade us of your undaunted courage, by misapplying to yourself the words of holy David; we know you fear, and are in an agony at this present, lest you should lose that superfluity of riches and honour which your party usurp. And whosoever covets, and so earnestly labours to keep such an incumbring surcharge of earthly things, cannot but have an earthquake still in his bones. You are not arm'd Remon-

82 Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence, &c.

strant, nor any of your band; you are not dieted, nor your loins girt for spiritual valour, and christian warfare, the luggage is too great that follows your camp; your hearts are there, you march heavily: how shall we think you have not carnal fear, while we see you so subject to carnal desires?

Remonst. I do gladly fly to the bar.

Answ. To the bar with him then. Gladly you say. We believe you as gladly as your whole faction wished, and longed for the assembling of this parliament, as gladly as your beneficiaries the Priests came up to answer the complaints and outcries of all the shires.

Remonst. The Areopagi! who were those? truly my masters, I had thought this had been the name of the place, not of the men.

Answ. A soar-eagle would not stoop at a fly; but sure some Pedagogue stood at your elbow, and made it itch with this parlous criticism; they urged you with a decree of the sage and severe judges of Athens, and you cite them to appear for certain Paragogical contempts, before a capricious Pedanty of hot-liver'd grammarians. Mistake not the matter, courteous Remonstrant, they were not making Latins: if in dealing with an outlandish name, they thought it best not to screw the English mouth to a harsh foreign termination, so they kept the radical word, they did no more than the elegantest authors among the Greeks, Romans, and at this day the Italians in scorn of such a servility use to do. Remember how they mangle our British names abroad; what trespasses were it, if we in requital should as much neglect theirs? and our learned Chaucer did not stick to do so, writing Semyramis for Semiramis, Amphiorax for Amphiarus, K. Sejes for K. Ceyx the husband of Alcyone, with many other names strangely metamorphosed from the true Orthography, if he had made any account of that in these kind of words.

Remonst. Lest the world should think the press had of late forgot to speak any language other than libellous, this honest paper hath broken through the throng.

Answ. Mince the matter while you will, it shewed but green practice in the laws of discreet Rhetorique to blurt upon the ears of a judicious Parliament with such a presumptuous and over-weening Proem: but you do well to be the sewer of your own mess.

Remonst. That which you miscall the preface, was a too just complaint of the shameful number of libels.

Answ. How long is it that you and the prelatical troop have been in such distaste with libels? ask your Lysimachus Nicanor what defaming invectives have lately flown abroad against the subjects of Scotland, and our poor expelled brethren of New-England, the prelates rather applauding than shewing any dislike: and this hath been ever so, insomuch, that Sir Francis Bacon in one of his discourses complains of the bishops uneven hand over these pamphlets, confining those against bishops to darkness, but licensing those against puritans to be uttered openly, though with the greater mischief of leading into contempt the exercise of religion in the persons of sundry preachers, and disgracing the higher matter in the meaner person.

Remonst. A point no less essential to that proposed Remonstrance.

Answ. We know where the shoe wrings you, you fret, and are gall'd at the quick; and O what a death it is to the prelates to be thus un-visarded, thus uncased, to have the periwigs pluck'd off that cover your baldness, your inside nakedness thrown open to publick view! The Romans had a time once every year, when their slaves might freely speak their minds; 'twere hard if the free-born people of England, with whom the voice of truth for these many years, even against the proverb, hath not been heard but in corners, after all your monkish prohibitions, and expurgatorious indexes, your gags and snaffles, your proud Imprimaturs not to be obtained without the shallow surview, but not shallow hand of some mercenary, narrow-soul'd, and illiterate chaplain; when liberty of speaking, than which nothing is more sweet to man, was girded, and streight-laced almost to a broken-winded tizzic, if now at a good time, our time of Parliament, the very jubilee and resurrection of the state, if now the concealed, the aggrieved, and long persecuted

cuted truth, could not be suffered to speak; and though she burst out with some efficacy of words, could not be excused after such an injurious strangle of silence, nor avoid the censure of libelling, 'twere hard, 'twere something pinching in a kingdom of free spirits. Some princes, and great statists, have thought it a prime piece of necessary policy to thrust themselves under disguise into a popular throng, to stand the night long under eaves of houses, and low windows, that they might hear every where the utterances of private breasts, and amongst them find out the precious gem of truth, as amongst the numberless pebbles of the shore; whereby they might be the abler to discover, and avoid that deceitful and close-couch'd evil of flattery that ever attends them, and misleads them, and might skilfully know how to apply the several redresses to each malady of state, without trusting the disloyal information of parasites and sycophants: whereas now this permission of free writing, were there no good else in it, yet at some times thus licenc'd, is such an unripping, such an anatomy of the shiest and tenderest particular truths, as makes not only the whole nation in many points the wiser, but also presents and carries home to princes, and men most remote from vulgar concourse, such a full insight of every lurking evil, or restrained good among the commons, as that they shall not need hereafter in old cloaks, and false beards, to stand to the courtesy of a night-walking cudgeller for eaves-dropping, nor to accept quietly as a perfume, the over-head emptying of some salt lotion. Who could be angry therefore, but those that are guilty, with these free-spoken and plain-hearted men that are the eyes of their country, and the prospective-glasses of their prince? But these are the nettlers, these are the blabbing books that tell, though not half your fellows feats. You love toothless satyrs; let me inform you, a toothless satyr is as improper as a toothed sleek-stone, and as bullish.

Remonst. I beseech you, brethren, spend your logic upon your own works.

Answ. The peremptory analysis that you call it, I believe will be so hardy as once more to unpin your spruce fastidious oratory, to rumple her laces, her frizzles, and her bobins, tho' she wince, and sting never so peevishly.

Remonst. Those verbal exceptions are but light froth, and will sink alone.

Answ. O rare subtlety, beyond all that Cardan ever dreamt of! when, I beseech you, will light things sink? when will light froth sink alone? Here in your phrase, the same day that heavy plummets will swim alone. Trust this man, readers, if you please, whose divinity would reconcile England with Rome, and his philosophy make friends nature with the Chaos, sine pondere habentia pondus.

Remonst. That scum may be worth taking off which follows.

Anf. Spare your ladle, Sir, it will be as the bishop's foot in the broth; the scum will be found upon your own remonstrance.

Remonst. I shall desire all indifferent eyes to judge whether these men do not endeavour to cast unjust envy upon me.

Answ. Agreed.

Remonst. I had said that the civil polity as in general notion, hath sometimes varied, and that the civil came from arbitrary imposers; these gracious interpreters would needs draw my words to the present and particular government of our monarchy.

Answ. And deservedly have they done so; take up your logic else and see: civil polity, say you, hath sometimes varied, and came from arbitrary imposers; what proposition is this? Bishop Downam in his dialectics will tell you it is a general axiom, though the universal particle be not express'd, and you yourself in your defence so explain in these words as in general notion. Hence is justly inferr'd, he that says civil polity is arbitrary, says that the civil polity of England is arbitrary. The inference is undeniable, a thesis ad hypothesin, or from the general to the particular, an evincing argument in logic.

Remonst. Brethren, whiles ye desire to seem godly, learn to be less malicious.

Answ. Remonstrant, till you have better learnt your principles of logic, take not upon you to be a doctor to others.

84 Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence, &c.

Remonst. God blefs all good men from such charity.

Answ. I never found that logical maxims were uncharitable before, yet should a jury of logicians pass upon you, you would never be sav'd by the book.

Remonst. And our sacred monarchy from such friends.

Answ. Add, as the Prelates.

Remonst. If Episcopacy have yoked monarchy, it is the insolence of the persons, not the fault of the calling.

Answ. It was the fault of the persons, and of no calling; we do not count prelacy a calling.

Remonst. The testimony of a Pope (whom these men honour highly.)

Answ. That slanderous insertion was doubtless a pang of your incredible charity, the want whereof you lay so often to their charge; a kind token of your favour lapt up in a parenthesis, a piece of the clergy benevolence 'laid by to maintain the episcopal broil, whether the 1000 horse or no, time will discover: for certainly had those cavaliers come on to play their parts, such a ticket as this of highly honouring the Pope, from the hand of a Prelate, might have been of special use and safety to them that had car'd for such a ransom.

Remonst. And what says Antichrist?

Answ. Ask your brethren the Prelates that hold intelligence with him, ask not us. But is the Pope Antichrist now? good news! take heed you be not shent for this; for 'tis verily thought, that had this bill been put in against him in your last convocation, he would have been clear'd by most voices.

Remonst. Any thing serves against Episcopacy.

Answ. See the frowardness of this man, he would persuade us that the succession and divine right of bishopdom hath been unquestionable through all ages; yet when they bring against him kings, they were irreligious; Popes, they are Antichrist. By what Æra of computation, through what faery land, would the man deduce this perpetual bead-roll of uncontradicted Episcopacy? The Pope may as well boast his ungain said authority to them that will believe that all his contradictees were either irreligious or heretical.

Remonst. If the Bishops, saith the Pope, be declar'd to be of divine right, they would be exempted from regal power; and if there might be this danger in those kingdoms, why is this enviously upbraided to those of ours? who do gladly profess, &c.

Answ. Because your dissever'd principles were but like the mangled pieces of a gash'd serpent, that now begun to close, and grow together Popish again. Whatsoever you now gladly profess out of fear, we know what your drifts were when you thought yourselves secure.

Remonst. It is a foul slander to charge the name of Episcopacy with a faction, for the fact imputed to some few.

Answ. The more foul your faction that hath brought a harmless name into obloquy, and the fact may justly be imputed to all of ye that ought to have withstood it, and did not.

Remonst. Fie brethren! are ye the Presbyters of the Church of England, and dare challenge Episcopacy of faction?

Answ. Yes, as oft as Episcopacy dares be factious.

Remonst. Had you spoken such a word in the time of holy Cyprian, what had become of you?

Answ. They had neither been hal'd into your Gehenna at Lambeth, nor strapado'd with an oath ex officio by your bow-men of the arches: and as for Cyprian's time, the cause was far unlike, he indeed succeeded into an Episcopacy that began then to prelatize; but his personal excellence like an antidote overcame the malignity of that breeding corruption which was then a disease that lay hid for a while under shew of a full and healthy

healthy constitution, as those hydropic humours not discernable at first from a fair and juicy fleshiness of body, or that unwonted ruddy colour which seems graceful to a cheek otherwise pale; and yet arises from evil causes, either of some inward obstruction or inflammation, and might deceive the first physicians till they had learnt the sequel, which Cyprian's days did not bring forth; and the prelatis of Episcopacy which began then to burgeon and spread, had as yet, especially in famous men, a fair, though a false imitation of flourishing.

Remonst. Neither is the wrong less to make application of that which was most justly charg'd upon the practices and combinations of libelling separatists, whom I deservedly censur'd, &c.

Answ. To conclude this section, our Remonstrant we see is resolv'd to make good that which was formerly said of his book, that it was neither humble, nor a Remonstrance, and this his defence is of the same complexion. When he is constrain'd to mention the notorious violence of his clergy attempted on the Church of Scotland, he slightly terms it a fact imputed to some few; but when he speaks of that which the Parliament vouchsafes to name the City Petition, "which I," saith he, (as if the state had made him public censor) "deservedly censur'd." And how? as before for a tumultuary and underhand way of procured subscriptions, so now in his defence more bitterly, as the practices and combinations of libelling separatists, and the miszealous advocates thereof, justly to be branded for incendiaries. Whether this be for the honour of our chief city to be noted with such an infamy for a petition, which not without some of the magistrates, and great numbers of sober and considerable men, was orderly, and meekly presented, although our great clerks think that these men, because they have a trade, (as Christ himself, and St. Paul had) cannot therefore attain to some good measure of knowledge, and to a reason of their actions, as well as they that spend their youth in loitering, bezzling, and harlotting, their studies in unprofitable questions and barbarous sophistry, their middle age in ambition and idleness, their old age in avarice, dotage, and diseases: And whether this reflect not with a contumely upon the Parliament itself, which thought this petition worthy, not only of receiving, but of voting to a commitment, after it had been advocated, and mov'd for by some honourable and learned gentlemen of the house, to be call'd a combination of libelling separatists, and the advocates thereof to be branded for incendiaries; whether this appeach not the judgment and approbation of the Parliament, I leave to equal arbiters.

SECT. II.

Remonst. After the overflowing of your gall, you descend to Liturgy and Episcopacy.

Answ. The overflow being past, you cannot now in your own judgment impute any bitterness to their following discourses.

Remonst. Dr. Hall, whom you name, I dare say for honour's sake.

Answ. You are a merry man, Sir, and dare say much.

Remonst. And why should not I speak of martyrs, as the authors and users of this holy Liturgy?

Answ. As the authors! the translators, you might perhaps have said: for Edward the Sixth, as Hayward hath written in his story, will tell you upon the word of a king, that the order of the service, and the use thereof in the English tongue, is no other than the old service was, and the same words in English which were in Latin, except a few things omitted, so fond, that it had been a shame to have heard them in English; these are his words: whereby we are left uncertain who the author was, but certain that part of the work was esteem'd so absurd by the translators thereof, as was to be asham'd of in English. O but the martyrs were the refiners of it, for that only is left you to say. Admit they were, they could not refine a scorpion into a fish, though they had drawn it, and rinc'd it

it with never so cleanly cookery, which made them fall at variance among themselves about the use either of it, or the ceremonies belonging to it.

Remonst. Slight you them as you please, we bless God for such patrons of our good cause.

Answ. O Benedicite! Qui color ater erat, nunc est contrarius atro. Are not these they which one of your Bishops in print scornfully terms the Foxian confessors? Are not these they whose acts and monuments are not only so contemptible, but so hateful to the Prelates, that their story was almost come to be a prohibited Book, which for these two or three editions hath crept into the world by stealth, and at times of advantage, not without the open regret and vexation of the Bishops, as many honest men that had to do in setting forth the Book will justify? And now at a dead lift for your Liturgies you bless God for them: out upon such hypocrisy.

Remonst. As if we were bound to make good every word that falls from the mouth of every Bishop.

Answ. Your faction then belike is a subtile Janus, and hath two faces: your bolder face to set forward any innovations or scandals in the Church, your cautious and wary face to disavow them if they succeed not, that so the fault may not light upon the function, lest it should spoil the whole plot by giving it an irrecoverable wound. Wherefore else did you not long ago, as a good Bishop should have done, disclaim and protest against them? wherefore have you sate still, and comply'd and hood-wink'd, till the general complaints of the land have squeezed you to a wretched, cold and hollow-hearted confession of some prelatial riots both in this and other places of your Book? Nay, what if you still defend them as follows?

Remonst. If a Bishop have said that our Liturgy hath been so wisely and charitably fram'd as that the devotion of it yieldeth no cause of offence to a very Pope's ear.

Answ. O new and never heard of supererogative height of wisdom and charity in our Liturgy! Is the wisdom of God or the charitable framing of God's word otherwise inoffensive to the Pope's ear, than as he may turn it to the working of his mysterious iniquity? A little pulley would have stretch'd your wise and charitable frame it may be three inches further, that the devotion of it might have yielded no cause of offence to the very devil's ear, and that had been the same wisdom and charity surmounting to the highest degree. For Antichrist we know is but the devil's vicar, and therefore please him with your Liturgy, and you please his master.

Remonst. Would you think it requisite that we should chide and quarrel when we speak to the God of peace?

Answ. Eie, no Sir, but forecast our prayers so, that Satan and his instruments may take as little exception against them as may be, lest they should chide and quarrel with us.

Remonst. It is no little advantage to our cause and piety, that our Liturgy is taught to speak several languages for use and example.

Answ. The language of Ashdod is one of them, and that makes so many Englishmen have such a smattering of their Philistian mother. And indeed our Liturgy hath run up and down the world like an English galloping nun proffering herself, but we hear of none yet that bids money for her.

Remonst. As for that sharp censure of learned Mr. Calvin, it might well have been forborne by him in aliena republica.

Answ. Thus this untheological Remonstrant would divide the individual catholic Church into several republics: Know therefore that every worthy Pastor of the Church of Christ hath universal right to admonish over all the world within the Church; nor can that care be alien'd from him by any distance or distinction of nation, so long as in Christ all nations and languages are as one household.

Remonst. Neither would you think it could become any of our greatest divines to meddle with his charge.

Answ. It

Answ. It hath ill become 'em indeed to meddle so maliciously, as many of them have done, though that patient and Christian city hath borne hitherto all their profane scoffs with silence.

Remonst. Our Liturgy past the judgment of no less reverend heads than his own.

Answ. It brib'd their judgments with worldly engagements, and so past it.

Remonst. As for that unparallel'd discourse concerning the antiquity of Liturgies; I cannot help your wonder, but shall justify mine own assertion.

Answ. Your justification is but a miserable shifting off those testimonies of the ancientest fathers alledg'd against you, and the authority of some synodical canons, which are no warrant to us. We profess to decide our controversies only by the scriptures; but yet to repress your vain-glory, there will be voluntarily bestow'd upon you a sufficient conviction of your novelties out of succeeding antiquity.

Remonst. I cannot see how you will avoid your own contradiction, for I demand, is this order of praying and administration set or no? if it be not set, how is it an order? and if it be a set order both for matter and form.—

Answ. Remove that form, lest you tumble over it, while you make such haste to clap a contradiction upon others.

Remonst. If the forms were merely arbitrary, to what use was the prescription of an order?

Answ. Nothing will cure this man's understanding but some familiar and kitchen physic, which, with pardon, must for plainness sake be administer'd to him. Call hither your cook. The order of breakfast, dinner, and supper, answer me, is it set or no? Set. Is a man therefore bound in the morning to poacht eggs and vinegar, or at noon to brawn or beef, or at night to fresh salmon, and French kickshoe? may he not make his meals in order, though he be not bound to this or that viand? Doubtless the neat-finger'd artist will answer yes, and help us out of this great controversy without more trouble. Can we not understand an order in Church-assemblies of praying, reading, expounding, and administering, unless our prayers be still the same crambe of words?

Remonst. What a poor exception is this, that Liturgies were compos'd by some particular men?

Answ. It is a greater presumption in any particular men to arrogate to themselves that which God universally gives to all his ministers. A minister that cannot be trusted to pray in his own words without being chew'd to, and fescu'd to a formal injunction of his rote-lesson, should as little be trusted to preach, besides the vain babble of praying over the same things immediately again; for there is a large difference in the repetition of some pathetical ejaculation rais'd out of the sudden earnestness and vigour of the inflam'd soul, (such as was that of Christ in the garden) from the continual rehearsal of our daily orisons; which if a man shall kneel down in a morning, and say over, and presently in another part of the room kneel down again, and in other words ask but still for the same things as it were out of one inventory, I cannot see how he will escape that heathenish battology of multiplying words, which Christ himself that has the putting up of our prayers, told us would not be acceptable in heaven. Well may men of eminent gifts set forth as many forms, and helps to prayer as they please; but to impose them upon Ministers lawfully call'd, and sufficiently try'd, as all ought to be ere they be admitted, is a supercilious tyranny, impropriating the spirit of God to themselves.

Remonst. Do we abridge this liberty by ordaining a public form?

Answ. Your Bishops have set as fair to do it as they durst for that old Pharisaical fear, that still dogs them, the fear of the people; though you will say you are none of those, still you would seem not to have join'd with the worst, and yet keep aloof off from that which is best. I would you would either mingle, or part: most true it is what Savanarola complains, that while he endeavour'd to reform the Church, his greatest enemies were still these lukewarm ones.

Remonst. And

88 Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence, &c.

Remonst. And if the Lord's prayer be an ordinary, and stinted form, why not others?

Answ. Because there be no other lords that can stint with like authority.

Remonst. If Justin Martyr said that the instructor of the people pray'd (as they falsely turn it) "according to his ability."

Answ. ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ will be so render'd to the world's end by those that are not to learn Greek of the Remonstrant, and so Langus renders it to his face, if he could see; and this ancient father mentions no antiphonies, or responsories of the people here, but the only plain acclamation of Amen.

Remonst. The instructor of the people pray'd according to his ability; 'tis true, so do ours: and yet we have a Liturgy, and so had they.

Answ. A quick come-off. The ancients us'd pikes and targets, and therefore guns and great ordnance, because we use both.

Remonst. Neither is this liberty of pouring out ourselves in our prayers ever the more impeacht by a public form.

Answ. Yes the time is taken up with a tedious number of liturgical tautologies, and impertinencies.

Remonst. The words of the council are full and affirmative.

Answ. Set the grave councils up upon their shelves again, and string them hard, lest their various and jangling opinions put their leaves into a flutter. I shall not intend this hot season to bid you the bafe through the wide and dusty champaine of the councils, but shall take counsel of that which counsel'd them, reason: and although I know there is an obsolete reprehension now at your tongue's end, yet I shall be bold to say, that reason is the gift of God in one man as well as in a thousand: by that which we have tasted already of their cisterns, we may find that reason was the only thing, and not any divine command that mov'd them to enjoin set forms of Liturgy. First, lest any thing in general might be missaid in their public Prayers through ignorance, or want of care, contrary to the faith: and next, lest the Arians, and Pelagians in particular should infect the people by their hymns, and forms of prayer. By the leave of these ancient fathers, this was no solid prevention of spreading heresy, to debar the ministers of God the use of their noblest talent, prayer in the congregation; unless they had forbid the use of sermons, and lectures too, but such as were ready made to their hands, as our homilies: or else he that was heretically dispos'd, had as fair an opportunity of infecting in his discourse, as in his prayer or hymn. As insufficiently, and to say truth, as imprudently did they provide by their contrived Liturgies, lest any thing should be erroneously pray'd through ignorance, or want of care in the ministers. For if they were careless, and ignorant in their prayers, certainly they would be more careless in their preaching, and yet more careless in watching over their flock; and what prescription could reach to bound them in both these? What if reason, now illustrated by the word of God, shall be able to produce a better prevention than these councils have left us against heresy, ignorance, or want of care in the ministry, that such wisdom and diligence be us'd in the education of those that would be ministers, and such strict and serious examination to be undergone ere their admission, as Saint Paul to Timothy sets down at large, and then they need not carry such an unworthy suspicion over the preachers of God's word, as to tutor their un-soundness with the * Abcie of a liturgy, or to diet their ignorance, and want of care, with the limited draught of a mattin, and even-song drench. And this may suffice after all their laboursome scrutiny of the councils.

Remonst. Our Saviour was pleas'd to make use in the celebration of his last and heavenly banquet both of the fashions, and words which were usual in the Jewish feasts.

Answ. What he pleas'd to make use of, does not justify what you please to force.

Remonst. The set forms of Prayer at the Mincha.

Anf. We

* i. e. A, b, c.

Answ. We will not buy your rabbinical fumes, we have one that calls us to buy of him pure gold try'd in the fire.

Remonst. In the Samaritan chronicle.

Answ. As little do we esteem your Samaritan trumpery, of which people Christ himself testifies, Ye worship ye know not what.

Remonst. They had their several songs.

Answ. And so have we our several psalms for several occasions, without gramercy to your Liturgy.

Remonst. Those forms which we have under the names of Saint James, &c. though they have some insertions which are plainly spurious, yet the substance of them cannot be taxt for other than holy and ancient.

Answ. Setting aside the odd coinage of your phrase, which no mint-master of language would allow for sterling, that a thing should be taxt for no other than holy and ancient, let it be suppos'd the substance of them may favour of something holy or ancient, this is but the matter; the form, and the end of the thing may yet render it either superstitious, fruitless, or impious, and so worthy to be rejected. The garments of a strumpet are often the same materially, that clothe a chaste matron, and yet ignominious for her to wear: the substance of the tempter's words to our Saviour were holy, but his drift nothing less.

Remonst. In what sense we hold the Roman a true Church, is so clear'd that the iron is too hot for their fingers.

Answ. Have a care it be not the iron to sear your own conscience.

Remonst. You need not doubt but that the alteration of the Liturgy will be consider'd by wiser heads than your own.

Answ. We doubt it not, because we know your head looks to be one.

Remonst. Our Liturgy symbolizeth not with Popish mass, neither as mass nor as Popish.

Answ. A pretty slip-skin conveyance to sift mass into no mass, and Popish into not Popish; yet saving this passing fine sophistical boulding hutch, so long as she symbolizes in form, and pranks herself in the weeds of Popish mass, it may be justly fear'd she provokes the jealousy of God, no otherwise than a wife affecting whorish attire kindles a disturbance in the eye of her discerning husband.

Remonst. If I find gold in the channel, shall I throw it away because it was ill laid?

Answ. You have forgot that gold hath been anathematiz'd for the idolatrous use; and to eat the good creatures of God once offer'd to idols, is in St. Paul's account to have fellowship with devils, and to partake of the devil's table. And thus you throttle yourself with your own similies.

Remonst. If the devils confess the Son of God, shall I disclaim that truth?

Answ. You sifted not so clean before, but you shuffle as foully now; as if there were the like necessity of confessing Christ, and using the Liturgy: we do not disclaim that truth, because we never believ'd it for their testimony; but we may well reject a Liturgy which had no being that we can know of, but from the corruptest times: if therefore the devil should be given never so much to Prayer, I should not therefore cease from that duty, because I learnt it not from him; but if he would commend to me a new Pater-noster, though never so seemingly holy, he should excuse me the form which was his, but the matter, which was none of his, he could not give me, nor I be said to take it from him. 'Tis not the goodness of matter therefore which is not, nor can be ow'd to the Liturgy, that will bear it out, if the form, which is the essence of it, be fantastick and superstitious, the end sinister, and the imposition violent.

Remonst. Had it been compos'd into this frame on purpose to bring Papists to our Churches,

Anfw. To bring them to our Churches? alas, what was that? unless they had been first fitted by repentance, and right instruction. You'll say, the word was there preacht which is the means of conversion; you should have given so much honour then to the word preacht, as to have left it to God's working without the interloping of a Liturgy baited for them to bite at.

Remonst. The project had been charitable and gracious.

Anfw. It was pharisaical, and vain-glorious, a greedy desire to win profelytes by conforming to them unlawfully; like the desire of Tamar, who to raise up seed to her husband, sate in the common road drest like a courtesan, and he that came to her committed incest with her. This was that which made the old Christians paganize, while by their scandalous and base conforming to heathenism they did no more, when they had done their utmost, but bring some pagans to christianize; for true Christians they neither were themselves, nor could make other such in this fashion.

Remonst. If there be found aught in Liturgy that may endanger a scandal, it is under careful hands to remove it.

Anfw. Such careful hands as have shown themselves sooner bent to remove and expel the men from the scandals, than the scandals from the men, and to lose a soul rather than a syllable or a surplice.

Remonst. It is idoliz'd they say in England, they mean at Amsterdam.

Anfw. Be it idoliz'd therefore where it will, it is only idolatriz'd in England.

Remonst. Multitudes of people they say distaste it; more shame for those that have so mistaught them.

Anfw. More shame for those that regard not the troubling God's church with things by themselves confest to be indifferent, since true charity is afflicted, and burns at the offence of every little one. As for the christian multitude which you affirm to be so mistaught, it is evident enough, though you would declaim never so long to the contrary, that God hath now taught them to detest your Liturgy and Prelacy; God who hath promised to teach all his children, and to deliver them out of your hands that hunt and worry their souls: hence is it that a man shall commonly find more savoury knowledge in one lay-man, than in a dozen of cathedral Prelates; as we read in our Saviour's time that the common people had a reverend esteem of him, and held him a great prophet, whilst the gowned Rabbies, the incomparable, and invincible doctors were of opinion that he was a friend of Beelzebub.

Remonst. If the multitude distaste wholesome doctrine, shall we to humour them abandon it?

Anfw. Yet again! as if there were like necessity of saving doctrine, and arbitrary if not unlawful, or inconvenient Liturgy: who would have thought a man could have thwackt together so many incongruous similitudes, had it not been to defend the motley incoherence of a patch'd missal?

Remonst. Why did not other churches conform to us? I may boldly say ours was, and is the more noble church.

Anfw. O Laodicean, how vainly and how carnally dost thou boast of nobleness, and precedency! more lordly you have made our church indeed, but not more noble.

Remonst. The second quære is so weak, that I wonder it could fall from the pens of wise men.

Anfw. You're but a bad fencer, for you never make a proffer against another man's weakness; but you leave your own side always open: mark what follows.

Remonst. Brethren, can ye think that our reformers had any other intentions than all the other founders of Liturgies, the least part of whose care was the help of the minister's weakness?

Anfw. Do you not perceive the noose you have brought yourself into, whilst you were so brief to taunt other men with weakness? Is it clean out of your mind what you cited from

from among the councils; that the principal scope of those Liturgy-founders was to prevent either the malice or the weakness of the ministers, their malice of infusing heresy in their forms of Prayer; their weakness, lest something might be composed by them thro' ignorance or want of care contrary to the faith? Is it not now rather to be wondred that such a weakness could fall from the pen of such a wise Remonstrant man?

Remonst. Their main drift was the help of the people's devotion, that they knowing before the matter that should be sued for.——

Answ. A solicitous care, as if the people could be ignorant of the matter to be prayed for; seeing the heads of public Prayer are either ever constant, or very frequently the same.

Remonst. And the words wherewith it should be cloth'd, might be the more prepar'd, and be so much the more intent, and less distracted.

Answ. As for the words, it is more to be feared lest the same continually should make them careless or sleepy, than that variety on the same known subject should distract; variety (as both music and rhetoric teacheth us) erects and rouzes an auditory, like the masterful running over many cords and divisions; whereas if men should ever be humming the drone of one plain song, it would be a dull opiat to the most wakeful attention.

Remonst. Tell me, is this Liturgy good or evil?

Answ. It is evil: repair the Acheloian horn of your Dilemma how you can, against the next push.

Remonst. If it be evil, it is unlawful to be used.

Answ. We grant you, and we find you have not your salve about you.

Remonst. Were the imposition amiss, what is that to the people?

Answ. Not a little, because they bear an equal part with the Priest in many places, and have their cues and versets as well as he.

Remonst. The ears and hearts of our people look for a settled Liturgy.

Answ. You deceive your self in their ears and hearts, they look for no such matter.

Remonst. The like answer serves for Homilies, surely were they enjoin'd to all, &c.

Answ. Let it serve for them that will be ignorant, we know that Hayward their own creature writes, that for defect of Preachers, Homilies were appointed to be read in churches, while Edward VI. reigned.

Remonst. Away then with the book, whilst it may be supplied with a more profitable nonsense.

Answ. Away with it rather, because it will be hardly supplied with a more unprofitable nonsense, than is in some passages of it to be seen.

S E C T. III.

Remonst. Thus their cavils concerning Liturgy are vanisht.

Answ. You wanted but Hey-passe to have made your transition like a mystical man of Sturbridge. But for all your sleight of hand, our just exceptions against Liturgy are not vanisht, they stare you still in the face.

Remonst. Certainly had I done so, I had been no less worthy to be spit upon for my saucy uncharitableness, than they are now for their uncharitable falshood.

Answ. We see you are in choler, therefore 'till you cool a while we turn us to the ingenuous reader. See how this Remonstrant would invest himself conditionally with all the rheum of the town, that he might have sufficient to bespaul his brethren. They are accused by him of uncharitable falshood, whereas their only crime hath been, that they have too credulously thought him, if not an over-logical, yet a well-meaning man; but now we find him either grossly deficient in his principles of Logic, or else purposely bent to delude the Parliament with equivocal sophistry, scattering among his periods ambiguous words, whose interpretation he will afterwards dispense according to his pleasure,

laying before us universal propositions, and then thinks when he will to pinion them with a limitation: for say Remonstrant,

Remonst. Episcopal government is cried down abroad by either weak or factious persons.

Answ. Chuse you whether you will have this proposition proved to you to be ridiculous, or sophistical; for one of the two it must be. Step again to Bishop Downam your patron, and let him gently catechise you in the grounds of Logic; he will shew you that this axiom, "episcopal government is cry'd down abroad by either weak or factious persons," is as much as to say, they that cry down episcopacy abroad, are either weak or factious persons. He will tell you that this axiom contains a distribution, and that all such axioms are general; and lastly, that the distribution in which any part is wanting, or abundant, is faulty, and fallacious. If therefore distributing by the adjuncts of faction and weakness, the persons that decry Episcopacy, and you made your distribution imperfect for the nonce, you cannot but be guilty of fraud intended toward the honourable court, to whom you wrote. If you had rather vindicate your honesty, and suffer in your want of art, you cannot condemn them of uncharitable falshood, that attributed to you more skill than you had, thinking you had been able to have made a distribution, as it ought to be, general and full; and so any man would take it, the rather as being accompanied with that large word (abroad) and so take again either your manifest lesing, or manifest ignorance.

Remonst. Now come these brotherly slanderers.

Answ. Go on dissembling Joab, as still your use is, call brother and smite; call brother and smite, 'till it be said of you, as the like was of Herod, a man had better be your hog than your brother.

Remonst. Which never came within the verge of my thoughts.

Answ. Take a metaphor or two more as good, the precinct, or the diocese of your thoughts.

Remonst. Brethren, if you have any remainders of modesty or truth, cry God mercy.

Answ. Remonstrant, if you have no ground-work of Logic, or plain-dealing in you, learn both as fast as you can.

Remonst. Of the same strain is their witty descant of my confoundedness.

Answ. Speak no more of it, it was a fatal word that God put into your mouth when you began to speak for episcopacy, as boding confusion to it.

Remonst. I am still, and shall ever be thus self-confounded, as confidently to say that he is no peaceable, and right-affected son of the church of England, that doth not wish well to Liturgy and Episcopacy.

Answ. If this be not that saucy uncharitableness, with which in the foregoing page you voluntarily invested your self with thought to have shifted it off, let the Parliament judge, who now themselves are deliberating whether Liturgy and Episcopacy be to be well wisht to, or no.

Remonst. This they say they cannot but rank amongst my notorious---speak out masters, I would not have that word stick in your teeth, or in your throat.

Answ. Take your spectacles, Sir, it sticks in the paper, and was a pectoral roule we prepared for you to swallow down to your heart.

Remonst. Wanton wits must have leave to play with their own sterne.

Answ. A meditation of yours doubtless observed at Lambeth from one of the Archiepiscopal Kittens.

Remonst. As for that form of episcopal government, surely could those look with my eyes, they would see cause to be ashamed of this their injurious misconceit.

Answ. We must call the barber for this wise sentence; one Mr. Ley the other day writ a treatise of the Sabbath, and in his Preface puts the wisdom of Baalam's ass upon one of our Bishops, bold man for his labour; but we shall have more respect to our Remonstrant,
and

and liken him to the ass's master, though the story say he was not so quick-sighted as his beast. Is not this Baalam the son of Beor, the man whose eyes are open, that said to the Parliament, surely could those look with my eyes; boast not of your eyes, 'tis feared you have Baalam's disease, a pearl in your eye, Mammon's prestriction.

Remonst. Alas we could tell you of China, Japan, Peru, Brazil, New-England, Virginia, and a thousand others that never had any Bishops to this day.

Answ. O do not foil your cause thus, and trouble Ortelius; we can help you, and tell you where they have been ever since Constantine's time at least, in a place called Mundus alter & idem, in the spacious and rich countries of Crapulia, Pamphagonia, Yuronia, and in the dukedom of Orgilia, and Variana, and their Metropolis of Ucalegonium. It was an oversight that none of your prime Antiquaries could think of these venerable monuments to deduce Episcopacy by; knowing that Mercurius Britannicus had them forthcoming.

S E C T. IV.

Remonst. Hitherto they have flourish'd, now I hope they will strike.

Answ. His former transition was in the fair about the juglers, now he is at the Pageants among the whiffers.

Remonst. As if arguments were Almanacks.

Answ. You will find some such as will prognosticate your date, and tell you that after your long Summer Solstice, the Æquator calls for you, to reduce you to the ancient and equal house of Libra.

Remonst. Truly brethren, you have not well taken the height of the Pole.

Answ. No marvel, there be many more that do not take well the height of your pole; but will take better the declination of your altitude.

Remonst. He that said I am the way, said that the old way was the good way.

Answ. He bids ask of the old paths, or for the old ways, where or which is the good way; which implies that all old ways are not good, but that the good way is to be searcht with diligence among the old ways, which is a thing that we do in the oldest records we have, the gospel. And if others may chance to spend more time with you in canvassing later antiquity, I suppose it is not for that they ground themselves thereon; but that they endeavour by shewing the corruptions, incertainties, and disagreements of those volumes, and the easiness of erring, or overslipping in such a boundless and vast search, if they may not convince those that are so strongly persuaded thereof; yet to free ingenuous minds from that over-awful esteem of those more ancient than trusty fathers, whom custom and fond opinion, weak principles, and the neglect of sounder and superiour knowledge hath exalted so high as to have gain'd them a blind reverence; whose books in bigness and number so endless and immeasurable, I cannot think that either God or nature, either divine or human wisdom, did ever mean should be a rule or reliance to us in the decision of any weighty and positive doctrine: for certainly every rule and instrument of necessary knowledge that God hath given us, ought to be so in proportion, as may be wielded and manag'd by the life of man, without penning him up from the duties of human society; and such a rule and instrument of knowledge perfectly is the holy bible. But he that shall bind himself to make antiquity his rule, if he read but part, besides the difficulty of choice, his rule is deficient, and utterly unsatisfying; for there may be other writers of another mind, which he hath not seen; and if he undertake all, the length of man's life cannot extend to give him a full and requisite knowledge of what was done in antiquity. Why do we therefore stand worshipping and admiring this unactive and lifeless Colossus, that like a carved giant terribly menacing to children and weaklings, lifts up his club, but strikes not, and is subject to the muting of every sparrow? if you let him rest upon his Basis, he may perhaps delight the eyes of some with his huge and mountainous bulk, and the quaint workmanship of his

his massy limbs: but if you go about to take him in pieces, ye marr him; and if you think, like Pigmies, to turn and wind him whole as he is, besides your vain toil and sweat, he may chance to fall upon your own heads. Go therefore, and use all your art, apply your sledges, your levers, and your iron crows, to heave and hale your mighty Polypheme of antiquity to the delusion of novices, and unexperienc'd christians. We shall adhere close to the scriptures of God, which he hath left us as the just and adequate measure of truth, fitted and proportion'd to the diligent study, memory, and use of every faithful man, whose every part consenting and making up the harmonious Symmetry of compleat instruction, is able to set out to us a perfect man of God, or Bishop thoroughly furnish'd to all the good works of his charge: and with this weapon, without stepping a foot further, we shall not doubt to batter and throw down your Nebuchadnezzar's image, and crumble it like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors, as well the gold of those apostolic successors that you boast of, as your Constantinian silver, together with the iron, the brass, and the clay of those muddy and strawy ages that follow.

Remonst. Let the boldest forehead of them all deny that Episcopacy hath continued thus long in our island, or that any till this age contradicted it.

Answ. That bold forehead you have cleanly put upon yourself, 'tis you who deny that any till this age contradicted it; no forehead of ours dares do so much: you have row'd yourself fairly between the Scylla and Charybdis, either of impudence or nonsense, and now betake you to whether you please.

Remonst. As for that supply of accessory strength which I not beg.

Answ. Your whole Remonstrance does nothing else but beg it, and your Fellow-Prelates do as good as whine to the Parliament for their flesh-pots of Egypt, making sad orations at the funeral of your dear Prelacy, like that doubty centurion Afranius in Lucian; who to imitate the noble Pericles in his Epitaphian speech, stepping up after the battle to bewail the slain Severianus, falls into a pitiful condolment, to think of those costly suppers, and drinking banquets which he must now taste of no more; and by then he had done, lack'd but little to lament the dear-lov'd memory, and calamitous loss of his capon and white broth.

Remonst. But raise and evince from the light of nature, and the rules of just policy, for the continuance of those things which long use, and many laws have firmly establish'd as necessary and beneficial.

Answ. Open your eyes to the light of grace, a better guide than nature. Look upon the mean condition of Christ and his Apostles, without that accessory strength you take such pains to raise from the light of nature and policy: take divine counsel, "Labour not for the things that perish:" you would be the salt of the earth; if that favour be not found in you, do not think much that the time is now come to throw you out, and tread you under foot: hark how St. Paul, writing to Timothy, informs a true Bishop; "Bishops (saith he) must not be greedy of filthy lucre; and having food and rayment, let us be therewith content: but they (saith he, meaning more especially in that place Bishops) that will be rich, fall into temptation, and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition: for the love of money is the root of all evil, which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith." How can we therefore expect sound doctrine, and the solution of this our controversy from any covetous and honour-hunting Bishop, that shall plead so stiffly for these things, while St. Paul thus exhorts every Bishop; "But thou, O Man of God, flee these things?" As for the just policy, that long use and custom, and those many laws which you say have conferred these benefits upon you; it hath been nothing else but the superstitious devotion of Princes and great men that knew no better, or the base importunity of begging Friars, haunting and harassing the death-beds of men departing this life, in a blind and wretched condition of hope to merit heaven for the building of Churches, Cloysters, and Convents. The most of your vaunted possessions, and those

those proud endowments that ye as sinfully waste, what are they but the black revenues of Purgatory, the price of abused and murder'd souls, the damned Simony of Trentals, and Indulgences to mortal sin? How can ye chuse but inherit the curse that goes along with such a Patrimony? alas! if there be any releasement, any mitigation, or more tolerable being for the souls of our misguided ancestors; could we imagine there might be any recovery to some degree of ease left for as many of them as are lost, there cannot be a better way than to take the misbestowed wealth which they were cheated of, from these our Prelates, who are the true successors of those that popt them into the other world with this conceit of meriting by their goods, which was their final undoing: and to bestow their beneficent gifts upon places and means of christian education, and the faithful labourers in God's harvest, that may incessantly warn the posterity of Dives, lest they come where their miserable forefather was sent by the coufenage and misleading of avaritious and worldly Prelates.

Remonst. It will stand long enough against the battery of their paper-pellets.

Answ. That must be try'd without a square cap in the council; and if pellets will not do, your own canons shall be turn'd against you.

Remonst. They cannot name any man in this nation that ever contradicted Episcopacy, till this present age.

Answ. What an over-worn and bed-rid argument is this, the last refuge ever of old fallshood, and therefore a good sign I trust that your castle cannot hold out long. This was the plea of Judaism, and idolatry against Christ and his Apostles, of Papacy against Reformation; and perhaps to the frailty of flesh and blood in a man destitute of better enlightening, may for some while be pardonable: for what has fleshly apprehension other to subsist by than succession, custom, and visibility; which only hold, if in his weakness and blindness he be loth to lose, who can blame? But in a Protestant nation that should have thrown off these tatter'd rudiments long ago, after the many strivings of God's spirit, and our fourscore years vexation of him in this our wilderness since reformation began, to urge these rotten principles, and twit us with the present age, which is to us an age of ages wherein God is manifestly come down among us, to do some remarkable good to our church or state; is as if a man should tax the renovating and reingendring spirit of God with innovation, and that new creature for an upstart novelty: yea, the new Jerusalem, which without your admired link of succession descends from heaven, could not escape some such like censure. If you require a further answer, it will not misbecome a christian to be either more magnanimous, or more devout than Scipio was; who instead of other answer to the frivolous accusations of Petilius the Tribune, "This day Romans (saith he) I fought with Hanibal prosperously; let us all go and thank the Gods that gave us so great a victory:" in like manner will we now say, not caring otherwise to answer this un-protestant-like objection; in this age, Britains, God hath reform'd his church after many hundred years of Popish corruption; in this age he hath freed us from the intolerable yoke of Prelates and Papal discipline; in this age he hath renewed our Protestation against all those yet remaining dregs of superstition. Let us all go, every true protested Britain, throughout the three Kingdoms, and render thanks to God the father of light, and fountain of heavenly grace, and to his son CHRIST our Lord; leaving this Remonstrant and his adherents to their own designs, and let us recount even here without delay, the patience and long-suffering that God hath used towards our blindness and hardness time after time. For he being equally near to his whole creation of mankind, and of free power to turn his benefic and fatherly regard to what region or kingdom he pleases, hath yet ever had this island under the special indulgent eye of his providence: and pitying us the first of all other nations, after he had decreed to purify and renew his Church that lay wallowing in idolatrous pollutions, sent first to us a healing messenger to touch softly our sores, and carry a gentle hand over our wounds: he knock'd once and twice and came again, opening our drowsy eye-
lids

lids leisurely by that glimmering light which Wicklef, and his followers dispersed; and still taking off by degrees the inveterate scales from our nigh perish'd sight, purg'd also our deaf ears, and prepared them to attend his second warning trumpet in our grand-fires days. How else could they have been able to have receiv'd the sudden assault of his reforming spirit, warring against human principles, and carnal sense, the pride of flesh that still cry'd up antiquity, custom, canons, councils and laws; and cry'd down the truth for novelty, schism, prophaneness and sacrilege? whenas we that have liv'd so long in abundant light, besides the sunny reflection of all the neighbouring churches, have yet our hearts riveted with those old opinions, and so obstructed and benumb'd with the same fleshly reasonings, which in our forefathers soon melted and gave way, against the morning beam of Reformation. If God had left undone this whole work so contrary to flesh and blood, till these times; how should we have yielded to his heavenly call, had we been taken, as they were, in the starkness of our ignorance; that yet after all these spiritual preparatives and purgations, have our earthly apprehensions so clamm'd and furr'd with the old leaven? O if we freeze at noon after their early thaw, let us fear lest the sun for ever hide himself, and turn his orient steps from our ingrateful horizon, justly condemn'd to be eternally benighted. Which dreadful judgment, O thou the ever-begotten light and perfect image of the Father! intercede, may never come upon us, as we trust thou hast; for thou hast open'd our difficult and sad times, and given us an unexpected breathing after our long oppressions: thou hast done justice upon those that tyrannized over us, while some men waver'd and admir'd a vain shadow of wisdom in a tongue nothing slow to utter guile, though thou hast taught us to admire only that which is good, and to count that only praise-worthy which is grounded upon thy divine precepts. Thou hast discover'd the plots, and frustrated the hopes of all the wicked in the land, and put to shame the persecutors of thy Church: thou hast made our false Prophets to be found a lye in the sight of all the people, and chased them with sudden confusion and amazement before the redoubled brightness of thy descending cloud, that now covers thy tabernacle. Who is there that cannot trace thee now in thy beamy walk through the midst of thy sanctuary, amidst those golden Candle-sticks, which have long suffered a dimness amongst us through the violence of those that had seiz'd them, and were more taken with the mention of their gold than of their starry light; teaching the doctrine of Balaam, to cast a stumbling-block before thy servants, commanding them to eat things sacrificed to idols, and forcing them to fornication? Come therefore, O thou that hast the seven stars in thy right hand, appoint thy chosen Priests according to their orders and courses of old, to minister before thee, and duly to press and pour out the consecrated oil into thy holy and ever-burning lamps. Thou hast sent out the spirit of prayer upon thy servants over all the land to this effect, and stirr'd up their vows as the sound of many waters about thy throne. Every one can say, that now certainly thou hast visited this land, and hast not forgotten the utmost corners of the earth, in a time when men had thought that thou wast gone up from us to the farthest end of the heavens, and hadst left to do marvellously among the sons of these last ages. O perfect and accomplish thy glorious acts! for men may leave their works unfinish'd, but thou art a God, thy nature is perfection: shouldst thou bring us thus far onward from Egypt to destroy us in this wilderness, though we deserve; yet thy great name would suffer in the rejoicing of thine enemies, and the deluded hope of all thy servants. When thou hast settled peace in the Church, and righteous judgment in the kingdom, then shall all thy saints address their voices of joy and triumph to thee, standing on the shore of that red sea into which our enemies had almost driven us. And he that now for haste snatches up a plain ungarnish'd present as a thank-offering to thee, which could not be deferr'd in regard of thy so many late deliverances wrought for us one upon another, may then perhaps take up a harp, and sing thee an elaborate song to generations. In that day it shall no more be said as in scorn, this or that was never held

held so till this present age, when men have better learnt that the times and seasons pass along under thy feet, to go and come at thy bidding: and as thou didst dignify our father's days with many revelations above all the foregoing ages, since thou tookest the flesh; so thou canst vouchsafe to us (though unworthy) as large a portion of thy spirit as thou pleasest: for who shall prejudice thy all-governing will? seeing the power of thy grace is not past away with the primitive times, as fond and faithless men imagine, but thy kingdom is now at hand, and thou standing at the door. Come forth out of thy royal chambers, O prince of all the kings of the earth! put on the visible robes of thy imperial majesty, take up that unlimited scepter which thy almighty father hath bequeathed thee; for now the voice of thy bride calls thee, and all creatures sigh to be renew'd.

SECT. V.

Remonst. Neglect not the gift which was given thee by Prophecy, and by laying on the hands of Presbytery.

Answ. The English translation expresses the article (the), and renders it the Presbytery, which you do injury to omit.

Remonst. Which I wonder ye can so press, when Calvin himself takes it of the Office, and not of the men.

Answ. You think then you are fairly quit of this proof, because Calvin interprets it for you, as if we could be put off with Calvin's name, unless we be convinced with Calvin's reason; the word *πρεσβυτέριον* is a collective noun, signifying a certain number of men in one order, as the word privy-council with us, and so Beza interprets, that knew Calvin's mind doubtless, with whom he liv'd. If any amongst us should say the privy-council ordain'd it, and thereby constrain us to understand one man's authority, should we not laugh at him? And therefore when you have us'd all your cramping irons to the text, and done your utmost to cram a Presbytery into the skin of one person, 'twill be but a piece of frugal nonsense. But if your meaning be with a violent Hyperbaton to transpose the text, as if the words lay thus in order, "neglect not the gift of Presbytery;" this were a construction like a Harquebuzer shot over a file of words twelve deep, without authority to bid them stoop; or to make the word Gift, like the river Mole in Surry, to run under the bottom of a long line, and so start up to govern the word Presbytery, as in immediate Syntaxis; a device ridiculous enough to make good that old wife's tale of a certain Queen of England that sunk at Charing-cross, and rose up at Queenhithe. No marvel though the Prelates be a troublesome generation, and which way soever they turn them, put all things into a foul discomposure, when to maintain their domineering they seek thus to rout and dis-array the wise and well-couch'd order of Saint Paul's own words, using either a certain textual riot to chop off the hands of the word Presbytery, or else a like kind of Simony to clap the word Gift between them. Besides, if the verse must be read according to this transposition, *μὴ ἀμέλει τὸ ἐν σοὶ χάρισμα τὸ πρεσβυτερίῳ*, it would be improper to call ordination *χάρισμα*, whenas it is rather only *χρίσμα*, an outward testimony of approbation; unless they will make it a Sacrament, as the Papists do: But surely the Prelates would have Saint Paul's words ramp one over another, as they use to climb into their livings and Bishopricks.

Remonst. Neither need we give any other satisfaction to the point, than from Saint Paul himself, 2 Timothy i. 6. "Stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the imposition of my hands;" mine, and not others.

Answ. Ye are too quick; this last place is to be understood by the former, as the law of method, which bears chief sway in the art of teaching, requires, that clearest and plainest expressions be set foremost, to the end they may enlighten any following obscurity; and wherefore we should not attribute a right method to the teachableness of Scripture, there can be no reason given: to which method, if we shall now go contrary, besides the breaking of a logical rule, which the Remonstrant hitherto we see hath made

98 Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence, &c.

little account of, we shall also put a manifest violence and impropriety upon a known word against his common signification, in binding a collective to a singular person. But if we shall, as Logic (or indeed reason) instructs us, expound the latter place by the former cited, and understand, (by the imposition of my hands) that is, of mine chiefly as an Apostle, with the joint authority and assistance of the Presbytery, there is nothing more ordinary or kindly in speech, than such a phrase as expresses only the chief in any action, and understands the rest. So that the imposition of Saint Paul's hands, without more expression in this place, cannot exclude the joint act of the Presbytery affirmed by the former text.

Remonst. In the mean while see brethren how you have with Simon fish'd all night, and caught nothing.

Answ. If we fishing with Simon the Apostle can catch nothing, see what you can catch with Simon Magus; for all his hooks and fishing implements he bequeath'd among you.

S E C T. XIII.

Remonst. We do again profess, that if our Bishops challenge any other power than was delegated to, and required of Timothy and Titus, we shall yield them usurpers.

Answ. Ye cannot compare an ordinary Bishop with Timothy, who was an extraordinary man, foretold and promis'd to the Church by many prophecies, and his name join'd as collateral with Saint Paul, in most of his apostolic epistles, even where he writes to the Bishops of other Churches, as those in Philippi. Nor can you prove out of the Scripture that Timothy was Bishop of any particular place; for that wherein it is said in the third verse of the first Epistle, "As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus," will be such a gloss to prove the constitution of a Bishop by, as would not only be not so good as a Bourdeaux gloss; but scarce be receiv'd to varnish a Vizard of Modona. All that can be gathered out of holy writ concerning Timothy is, that he was either an Apostle, or an Apostle's extraordinary vice-gerent, not confin'd to the charge of any place. The like may be said of Titus, (as those words import in the 5th verse) that he was for that cause left in Crete, that he might supply or proceed to set in order that which Saint Paul in apostolic manner had begun, for which he had his particular commission, as those words found, (as I had appointed thee.) So that what he did in Crete, cannot so much be thought the exercise of an ordinary function, as the direction of an inspired mouth. No less also may be gather'd from the 2 Cor. viii. 23.

Remonst. You descend to the angels of the seven Asian Churches, your shift is, that the word angel is here taken collectively, not individually.

Answ. That the word is collective, appears plainly, Revel. ii.

First, Because the text itself expounds it so; for having spoken all the while as to the angel, the seventh verse concludes that this was spoken to the Churches. Now if the Spirit conclude collectively, and kept the same tenor all the way, for we see not where he particularizes; then certainly he must begin collectively, else the construction can be neither Grammatical nor Logical.

Secondly, If the word Angel be individual, then are the faults attributed to him individual: but they are such as for which God threatens to remove the candlestick out of his place, which is as much as to take away from that Church the light of his truth; and we cannot think he will do so for one bishop's fault. Therefore those faults must be understood collective, and by consequence the subject of them collective.

Thirdly, an individual cannot branch itself into subindividuals; but this word Angel doth in the tenth verse. "Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer; behold the devil shall cast some of you into prison." And the like from other places of this and the following chapter may be observed. Therefore it is no individual word, but a collective.

Fourthly, In the 24th verse this word Angel is made capable of a Pronoun plural, which could not be, unless it were a collective. As for the supposed manuscript of Tecla, and two or three other copies that have expung'd the copulative, we cannot prefer

fer them before the more receiv'd reading, and we hope you will not against the translation of your mother the Church of England, that past the revise of your chiefest Prelates: Besides this, you will lay an unjust censure upon the much-praised Bishop of Thyatira, and reckon him among those that had the doctrine of Jesabel, when the text says, he only suffer'd her. Whereas, if you will but let in a charitable conjunction, as we know your so much call'd-for charity will not deny, then you plainly acquit the Bishop, if you comprehend him in the name of Angel, otherwise you leave his case very doubtful.

Remonst. "Thou sufferest thy wife Jesabel:" was she wife to the whole company, or to one Bishop alone?

Answ. Not to the whole company doubtless, for that had been worse than to have been the Levite's wife in Gibeah: but here among all those that constantly read it otherwise, whom you trample upon, your good mother of England is down again in the throng, who with the rest reads it, that Woman Jesabel: but suppose it were wife, a man might as well interpret that word figuratively, as her name Jesabel no man doubts to be a borrow'd name.

Remonst. Yet what makes this for a diocesan Bishop? much every way.

Answ. No more than a special endorcement could make to puff up the fore-man of a Jury. If we deny you more precedence, than as the Senior of any society, or deny you this priority to be longer than annual; prove you the contrary from hence, if you can. That you think to do from the title of eminence, Angel: alas your wings are too short. 'Tis not ordination nor jurisdiction that is angelical, but the heavenly message of the Gospel, which is the office of all ministers alike; in which sense John the Baptist is call'd an Angel, which in Greek signifies a messenger, as oft as it is meant by a man, and might be so render'd here without treason to the Hierarchy; but that the whole book soars to a prophetic pitch in types, and allegories. Seeing then the reason of this borrow'd name is merely to signify the preaching of the Gospel, and that this preaching equally appertains to the whole Ministry; hence may be drawn a fifth argument, that if the reason of this borrowed name Angel be equally collective and communicative to the whole preaching ministry of the place, then must the name be collectively and communicatively taken; but the reason, that is to say, the office of preaching and watching over the flock, is equally collective and communicative: Therefore the borrow'd name itself is to be understood as equally collective and communicative to the whole preaching ministry of the place. And if you will contend still for a superiority in one person, you must ground it better than from this metaphor, which you may now deplore as the ax-head that fell into the water, and say, alas master, for it was borrow'd; unless you have as good a faculty to make iron swim, as you had to make light froth sink.

Remonst. What is, if this be not ordination and jurisdiction?

Answ. Indeed in the constitution, and founding of a Church, that some men inspired from God should have an extraordinary calling to appoint, to order and dispose, must needs be. So Moses, though himself no priest, sanctify'd, and ordained Aaron and his sons; but when all needful things be set, and regulated by the writings of the Apostles, whether it be not a mere folly to keep up a superior degree in the Church only for ordination and jurisdiction, it will be no hurt to debate a while. The Apostles were the builders, and, as it were, the architects of the Christian Church; wherein consisted their excellence above ordinary ministers? a Prelate would say in commanding, in controuling, in appointing, in calling to them, and sending from about them to all countries their Bishops and Archbishops as their deputies, with a kind of legantine power. No, no, vain Prelates, this was but as the scaffolding of a new edifice, which for the time must board, and overlook the highest battlements; but if the structure once finish'd, any passenger should fall in love with them, and pray that they might still stand, as being a singular grace, and strengthening to the house, who would otherwise think, but that the man were presently to be laid hold-on, and sent to his friends and kindred? The eminence of the Apostles consisted in their powerful preaching, their unwearied labouring in the

word, their unquenchable charity, which above all earthly respects like a working flame, had spun up to such a height of pure desire, as might be thought next to that love which dwells in God to save souls; which, while they did, they were contented to be the Off-scouring of the world, and to expose themselves willingly to all afflictions, perfecting thereby their hope through patience to a joy unspeakable. As for ordination, what is it, but the laying on of hands, an outward sign or symbol of admission? It creates nothing, it confers nothing; it is the inward calling of God that makes a minister, and his own painful study and diligence that manures and improves his ministerial Gifts. In the primitive times, many before ever they had received ordination from the apostles, had done the church noble service, as Apollos and others. It is but an orderly form of receiving a man already fitted, and committing to him a particular charge; the employment of preaching is as holy, and far more excellent; the care also and judgment to be used in the winning of souls, which is thought to be sufficient in every worthy minister, is an ability above that which is required in ordination: For many may be able to judge who is fit to be made a minister, that would not be found fit to be made ministers themselves; as it will not be deny'd that he may be the competent judge of a neat picture, or elegant poem, that cannot limn the like. Why therefore we should constitute a superior order in the church to perform an office which is not only every minister's function, but inferior also to that which he has a confessed right to; and why this Superiority should remain thus usurped, some wise Epimenides tell us. Now for jurisdiction, this dear Saint of the prelates, it will be best to consider, first, what it is: That sovereign lord, who in the discharge of his holy anointment from God the father, which made him supreme bishop of our Souls, was so humble as to say, "Who made me a judge, or a divider over ye?" hath taught us that a churchman's jurisdiction is no more but to watch over his flock in season, and out of season, to deal by sweet and efficacious instructions, gentle admonitions, and sometimes rounder reproofs: against negligence or obstinacy, will be required a rousing volley of pastorly threatnings; against a persisting stubbornness, or the fear of a reprobate sense, a timely separation from the flock by that interdictive sentence, lest his conversation unprohibited, or unbranded, might breathe a pestilential murrain into the other sheep. In sum, his jurisdiction is to see the thriving and prospering of that which he hath planted: what other work the prelates have found for chancellors and suffragans, delegates and officials, with all the hell-pestering rabble of sumners and apparators, is but an invasion upon the temporal magistrate, and affected by them as men that are not ashamed of the ensign and banner of antichrist. But true evangelical jurisdiction or discipline is no more, as was said, than for a minister to see to the thriving and prospering of that which he hath planted. And which is the worthiest work of these two, to plant as every minister's office is equally with the bishops, or to tend that which is planted, which the blind and undiscerning prelates call jurisdiction, and would appropriate to themselves as a business of higher dignity? Have patience therefore a little, and hear a law-case: A certain man of large possessions had a fair garden, and kept therein an honest and laborious servant, whose skill and profession was to set or sow all wholesome herbs, and delightful flowers, according to every season, and whatever else was to be done in a well-husbanded nursery of plants and fruits. Now, when the time was come that he should cut his hedges, prune his trees, look to his tender slips, and pluck up the weeds that hindered their growth, he gets him up by break of day, and makes account to do what was needful in his garden; and who would think that any other should know better than he how the day's work was to be spent? Yet for all this there comes another strange gardener that never knew the soil, never handled a dibble or spade to set the least pot-herb that grew there, much less had endur'd an hour's sweat or chilness, and yet challenges as his right the binding or unbinding of every flower, the clipping of every bush, the weeding and worming of every bed, both in that and all other gardens thereabout. The honest gar-

dener,

dener, that ever since the day-peep, till now the sun was grown somewhat rank, had wrought painfully about his banks and seed-plots, at his commanding voice turns suddenly about with some wonder; and although he could have well betem'd to have thank'd him of the ease he profer'd, yet loving his own handy-work, modestly refused him, telling him withal, that for his part, if he had thought much of his own pains, he could for once have committed the work to one of his fellow-labourers, for as much as it is well known to be a matter of less skill and less labour to keep a garden handsome, than it is to plant it, or contrive it, and that he had already perform'd himself. No, said the stranger, this is neither for you nor your fellows to meddle with, but for me only that am for this purpose in dignity far above you; and the provision which the Lord of the soil allows me in this office is, and that with good reason, ten-fold your wages. The gardener smil'd and shook his head; but what was determined, I cannot tell you till the end of this parliament.

Remonst. If in time you shall see wooden chalices, and wooden priests, thank yourselves.

Answ. It had been happy for this land, if your priests had been but only wooden; all England knows they have been to this island not wood, but wormwood, that have infected the third part of our waters, like that apostate star in the revelation, that many souls have died of their bitterness; and if you mean by wooden, illiterate or contemptible, there was no want of that sort among you; and their number increasing daily, as their laziness, their tavern-hunting, their neglect of all sound literature, and their liking of doltish and monastical school-men daily increas'd. What should I tell you how the universities, that men look should be fountains of learning and knowledge, have been poison'd and choak'd under your governance? And if to be wooden, be to be base, where could there be found among all the reformed churches, nay in the church of Rome itself, a baser brood of flattering and time-serving priests, according as God pronounces by Isaiah, the prophet that teacheth lies, he is the tail. As for your young scholars that petition for bishoprics and deaneries to encourage them in their studies, and that many gentlemen else will not put their sons to learning; away with such young mercenary striplings, and their Simoniackal fathers; God has no need of such, they have no part or lot in his vineyard: they may as well sue for nunneries, that they may have some convenient stowage for their wither'd daughters, because they cannot give them portions answerable to the pride and vanity they have bred them in. This is the root of all our mischief, that which they alledge for the encouragement of their studies should be cut away forthwith as the very bait of pride and ambition, the very garbage that draws together all the fowls of prey and ravin in the land to come and gorge upon the church. How can it be but ever unhappy to the church of England, while she shall think to entice men to the pure service of God by the same means that were used to tempt our Saviour to the service of the devil, by laying before him honour and preferment? Fit professors indeed are they like to be, to teach others that Godliness with content is great gain, whenas their godliness of teaching had not been but for worldly gain. The heathen philosophers thought that virtue was for its own sake inestimable, and the greatest gain of a teacher to make a soul virtuous; so Xenophon writes of Soerates, who never bargain'd with any for teaching them; he fear'd not lest those who had received so high a benefit from him, would not of their own free will return him all possible thanks. Was moral virtue so lovely, and so alluring, and heathen men so enamour'd of her, as to teach and study her with greatest neglect and contempt of worldly profit and advancement? And is christian piety so homely and so unpleasant, and christian men so cloyed with her, as that none will study and teach her, but for lucre and preferment! O stale-grown piety! O gospel rated as cheap as thy master, at thirty-pence, and not worth the study, unless thou canst buy those that will sell thee! O race of Capernaïtans, senseless of divine doctrine, and capable only of loaves and belly-cheer! But they will grant, perhaps,

perhaps, piety may thrive, but learning will decay: I would fain ask these men at whose hands they seek inferior things, as wealth, honour, their dainty fare, their lofty houses? No doubt but they will soon answer, that all these things they seek at God's hands. Do they think then that all these meaner and superfluous things come from God, and the divine gift of learning from the den of Plutus, or the cave of Mammon? Certainly never any clear spirit nursed up from brighter influences, with a soul enlarg'd to the dimensions of spacious art and high knowledge, ever enter'd there but with scorn, and thought it ever foul disdain to make pelf or ambition the reward of his studies; it being the greatest honour, the greatest fruit and proficiency of learned studies to despise these things. Not liberal science, but illiberal must that needs be, that mounts in contemplation merely for money. And what would it avail us to have a hireling Clergy, though never so learned? For such can have neither true wisdom nor grace; and then in vain do men trust in learning, where these be wanting. If in less noble and almost mechanic arts, according to the definitions of those authors, he is not esteem'd to deserve the name of a compleat architect, an excellent painter, or the like, that bears not a generous mind above the peasantly regard of wages and hire; much more must we think him a most imperfect, and incompleat divine, who is so far from being a contemner of filthy lucre, that his whole divinity is moulded and bred up in the beggarly, and brutish hopes of a fat prebendary, deanery, or bishopric; which poor and low-pitch'd desires, if they do but mix with those other heavenly intentions that draw a man to this study, it is justly expected that they should bring forth a base-born issue of divinity, like that of those imperfect, and putrid creatures that receive a crawling life from two most unlike procreants, the sun and mud. And in matters of religion, there is not any thing more intolerable than a learned fool, or a learned hypocrite; the one is ever coopt up at his empty speculations, a sot, an idiot for any use that mankind can make of him, or else sowing the world with nice and idle questions, and with much toil and difficulty wading to his auditors up to the eye-brows in deep shallows that wet not the instep: a plain unlearned man that lives well by that light which he has, is better and wiser, and edifies others more towards a godly and happy life than he. The other is still using his sophisticated arts, and bending all his studies how to make his insatiate avarice and ambition seem pious and orthodoxal, by painting his lewd and deceitful principles with a smooth and glossy varnish in a doctrinal way, to bring about his wickedest purposes. Instead of the great harm therefore that these men fear upon the dissolving of prelates, what an ease, and happiness will it be to us, when tempting rewards are taken away, that the cunningest and most dangerous mercenaries will cease of themselves to frequent the fold, whom otherwise scarce all the prayers of the faithful could have kept back from devouring the flock? But a true pastor of Christ's sending hath this especial mark, that for greatest labours, and greatest merits in the church, he requires either nothing, if he could so subsist, or a very common and reasonable supply of human necessities: We cannot therefore do better than to leave this care of ours to God, he can easily send labourers into his harvest, that shall not cry give, give, but be contented with a moderate and befitting allowance; nor will he suffer true learning to be wanting, where true grace and our obedience to him abounds: for if he give us to know him aright, and to practise this our knowledge in right establish'd discipline, how much more will he replenish us with all abilities in tongues and arts, that may conduce to his glory, and our good? He can stir up rich fathers to bestow exquisite education upon their children, and so dedicate them to the service of the gospel; he can make the sons of nobles his ministers, and princes to be his Nazarites; for certainly there is no employment more honourable, more worthy to take up a great spirit, more requiring a generous and free nurture, than to be the messenger and herald of heavenly truth from God to man, and by the faithful work of holy doctrine, to procreate a number of faithful men, making a kind of creation like to God's, by infusing his spirit and likeness into them,

them, to their salvation, as God did into him; arising to what climate soever he turn him, like that sun of righteousness that sent him, with healing in his wings, and new light to break in upon the chill and gloomy hearts of his hearers, raising out of darkness some barrenness a delicious and fragrant spring of saving knowledge, and good works. Can a man thus employed, find himself discontented, or dishonoured for want of admittance to have a pragmatical voice at sessions, and jail-deliveries? or because he may not as a judge sit out the wrangling noise of litigious courts to shreeve the purses of unconfessing and unmortified sinners, and not their souls, or be discouraged though men call him not lord, whenas the due performance of his office would gain him even from lords and princes, the voluntary title of father? Would he tug for a barony to sit and vote in parliament, knowing that no man can take from him the gift of wisdom and sound doctrine, which leaves him free, though not to be a member, yet a teacher, and persuader of the parliament? And in all wise apprehensions the persuasive power in man to win others to goodness by instruction is greater, and more divine, than the compulsive power to restrain men from being evil by terror of the law; and therefore Christ left Moses to be the law-giver, but himself came down amongst us to be a teacher, with which office his heavenly wisdom was so well-pleased, as that he was angry with those that would have put a piece of temporal judicature into his hands, disclaiming that he had any commission from above for such matters.

Such a high calling therefore as this, sends not for those drossy spirits that need the lure and whistle of earthly preferment, like those animals that fetch and carry for a morsel; no. She can find such as therefore study her precepts, because she teaches to despise preferment. And let not those wretched fathers think they shall impoverish the church of willing and able supply, though they keep back their sordid sperm begotten in the lustiness of their avarice, and turn them to their malting-kilns; rather let them take heed what lessons they instil into that lump of flesh which they are the cause of; lest, thinking to offer him as a present to God, they dish him out for the devil. Let the novice learn first to renounce the world, and so give himself to God, and not therefore give himself to God, that he may close the better with the world, like that false shepherd Palinode in the eclogue of May, under whom the poet lively personates our prelates, whose whole life is a recantation of their pastoral vow, and whose profession to forsake the world, as they use the matter, bogs them deeper into the world: Those our admired Spencer inveighs against, not without some presage of these reforming times.

The time was once and may again return,
 (For oft may happen that hath been beforen)
 When shepherds had none inheritance,
 Ne of land, nor fee in sufferance,
 But what might arise of the bare sheep,
 (Were it more or less,) which they did keep.
 Well ywis was it with shepherds, tho
 Nought having, nought feared they to forego:
 For Pan himself was their inheritance,
 And little them serv'd for their maintenance:
 The shepherds God so well them guided,
 That of naught they were unprovided.
 Butter enough, honey, milk and whey,
 And their flock fleeces them to array.
 But tract of time, and long prosperity
 (That nurse of vice, this of insolency)
 Lull'd the shepherds in such security,

That

That not content with loyal obeyſance,
 Some gan to gape for greedy governance,
 And match themſelves with mighty potentates,
 Lovers of lordſhips, and troublers of ſtates.
 Tho gan ſhepherds ſwains to looke aloft,
 And leave to live hard, and learne to lig ſoft.
 Tho under colour of ſhepherds ſome while
 There crept in wolves full of fraud and guile,
 That often devoured their own ſheep,
 And often the ſhepherd that did them keep.
 This was the firſt ſource of ſhepherds ſorrow,
 That now nill be quit with bale, nor borrow.

By all this we may conjecture, how little we need fear that the ungilding of our prelates, will prove the woodening of our prieſts. In the mean while let no man carry in his head either ſuch narrow, or ſuch evil eyes, as not to look upon the churches of Belgia and Helvetia, and that envied city Geneva: where in the chriſtian world doth learning more flouriſh than in theſe places? Not among your beloved jeſuits, nor their favourers, though you take all the prelates into the number, and inſtance in what kind of learning you pleaſe. And how in England all noble ſciences attending upon the train of Chriſtian doctrine may flouriſh more than ever; and how the able profeſſors of every art may with ample ſtipends be honeſtly provided; and finally, how there may be better care had that their hearers may benefit by them, and all this without the prelates; the courſes are ſo many and ſo eaſy, that I ſhall paſs them over.

Remonſt. It is God that makes the biſhop, the king that gives the biſhopric; What can you ſay to this?

Anſw. What you ſhall not long ſtay for: we ſay it is God that makes a biſhop, and the devil that makes him take a prelatical biſhopric; as for the king's gift, regal bounty may be excuſable in giving, where the biſhop's covetouſneſs is damnable in taking.

Remonſt. Many eminent divines of the churches abroad have earneſtly wiſhed themſelves in our condition.

Anſ. I cannot blame them, they were not only eminent, but ſupereminent Divines, and for ſtomach much like to Pompey the great, that could endure no equal.

Remonſt. The Babylonian note ſounds well in your ears, down with it, down with it even to the ground.

Anſw. You miſtake the matter, it was the Edomitish note; but change it, and if you be an angel, cry with the angel, "It is fallen, it is fallen."

Remonſt. But the God of heaven will, we hope, vindicate his own ordinance ſo long perpetuated to his church.

Anſw. Go rather to your god of this world, and ſee if he can vindicate your lordſhips, your temporal and ſpiritual tyrannies, and all your pelf; for the God of heaven is already come down to vindicate his ordinance from your ſo long perpetuated uſurpation.

Remonſt. If yet you can bluſh.

Anſw. This is a more Edomitish conceit than the former, and muſt be ſilenced with a counter quip of the ſame country. So often and ſo unfavourily has it been repeated, that the reader may well cry, Down with it, down with it for ſhame. A man would think you had eaten over-liberally of Eſau's red porridge, and from thence dream continually of bluſhing; or perhaps, to heighten your fancy in writing, are wont to ſit in your doctor's ſcarlet, which through your eyes infecting your pregnant imaginative with a red ſuffuſion, begets a continual thought of bluſhing: that you thus perſecute ingenuous men over all your book, with this one over-tired rubrical conceit ſtill of bluſhing; but if you have no
 mercy

mercy upon them, yet spare yourself, lest you bejude the good galloway, your own opinion after wit, and make the very conceit itself blush with spur-galling.

Remonst. The scandals of our inferior ministers I desired to have had less public.

Answ. And what your superior archbishop or bishops? O forbid to have it told in Gath! say you. O dauber! and therefore remove not impieties from Israel. Constantine might have done more justly to have punished those clerical faults which he could not conceal, than to leave them unpunished, that they might remain concealed: better had it been for him that the heathen had heard the fame of his justice, than of his wilful connivance and partiality; and so the name of God and his truth had been less blasphemed among his enemies, and the clergy amended, which daily, by this impunity, grew worse and worse. But, O to publish in the streets of Ascalon! sure some colony of Puritans have taken Ascalon from the Turk lately, that the Remonstrant is so afraid of Ascalon. The papists we know condole you, and neither Constantinople nor your neighbours of Morocco trouble you. What other Ascalon can you allude to?

Remonst. What a death it is to think of the sport and advantage these watchful enemies, these opposite spectators will be sure to make of our sin and shame?

Answ. This is but to fling and struggle under the inevitable net of God, that now begins to inviron you round.

Remonst. No one clergy in the whole christian world yields so many eminent scholars, learned preachers, grave, holy and accomplish'd divines, as this church of England doth at this day.

Answ. Ha, ha, ha!

Remonst. And long, and ever may it thus flourish.

Answ. O pestilent imprecation! flourish as it does at this day in the prelates?

Remonst. But oh forbid to have it told in Gath!

Answ. Forbid him rather, sacred parliament, to violate the sense of scripture, and turn that which is spoken of the afflictions of the church under her pagan enemies, to a pargetted concealment of those prelatical crying sins: for from these is prophaneness gone forth into all the land; they have hid their eyes from the sabbaths of the Lord; they have fed themselves, and not their flocks; with force and cruelty have they ruled over God's people: they have fed his sheep (contrary to that which St. Peter writes) not of a ready mind, but for filthy lucre; not as examples to the flock, but as being lords over God's heritage: and yet this dauber would daub still with his untempered mortar. But hearken what God says by the prophet Ezekiel, "Say unto them that daub this wall with untemper'd mortar, that it shall fall; there shall be an overflowing shower, and ye O great hailstones shall fall, and a stormy wind shall rend it, and I will say unto you, the wall is no more, neither they that daub'd it."

Remonst. Whether of us shall give a better account of our charity to the god of peace, I appeal.

Answ. Your charity is much to your fellow-offenders, but nothing to the numberless souls that have been lost by their false feeding: use not therefore so fillily the name of charity, as most commonly you do, and the peaceful attribute of God to a preposterous end.

Remonst. In the next section, like ill-bred sons, you spit in the face of your mother the church of England.

Answ. What should we do or say to this Remonstrant, that by his idle and shallow reasonings, seems to have been conversant in no divinity, but that which is colourable to uphold bishopricks? We acknowledge, and believe the catholic reformed church; and if any man be disposed to use a trope or figure, as Saint Paul did in calling her the common mother of us all, let him do as his own rhetoric shall persuade him. If therefore we must needs have a mother, and if the catholic church only be, and must be she, let all genealogy tell us, if it can, what we must call the church of England, unless we shall make every English protestant a kind of poetical Bacchus, to have two mothers: but mark, readers,

106 Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence, &c.

the crafty scope of these prelates; they endeavour to impress deeply into weak and superstitious fancies, the awful notion of a mother, that hereby they might cheat them into a blind and implicate obedience to whatsoever they shall decree, or think fit. And if we come to ask a reason of aught from our dear mother, she's invisible, under the lock and key of the prelates her spiritual adulterers; they only are the internuncio's, or the go-betweens, of this trim devis'd mummary: whatsoever they say, she says must be a deadly sin of disobedience not to believe. So that we, who by God's special grace have shaken off the servitude of a great male tyrant, our pretended father the pope, should now, if we be not betimes aware of these wily teachers, sink under the slavery of a female notion, the cloudy conception of a demy-island mother; and while we think to be obedient sons, should make ourselves rather the bastards, or the centaurs of their spiritual fornications.

Remonst. Take heed of the ravens of the valley.

Answ. The ravens we are to take heed on are yourselves, that would peck out the eyes of all knowing christians.

Remonst. Sit you merry, brethren.

Answ. So we shall when the furies of prelatical consciences will not give them leave to do so.

Queries. Whether they would not jeopard their ears rather, &c.

Answ. A punishment that awaits the merits of your bold accomplices, for the lopping, and stigmatizing of so many free-born christians.

Remonst. Whether the professed slovenliness in God's service, &c.

Answ. We have heard of Aaron and his linnen amice, but those days are past; and for your priest under the gospel, that thinks himself the purer, or the cleanlier in his office for his new-washed surplice, we esteem him for sanctity little better than Apollonius Thyanæus in his white frock, or the priest of Isis in his lawn sleeves, and they may all for holiness lie together in the suds.

Remonst. Whether it were not most lawful and just to punish your presumption and disobedience.

Answ. The punishing of that which you call our presumption and disobedience, lies not now within the execution of your fangs; the merciful God above, and our just parliament will deliver us from your Ephesian beasts, your cruel Nimrods, with whom we shall be ever fearless to encounter.

Remonst. God give you wisdom to see the truth, and grace to follow it.

Answ. I wish the like to all those that resist not the Holy Ghost; for of such God commands Jeremy, saying, "Pray not thou for them, neither lift up cry or prayer for them, neither make intercession to me, for I will not hear thee;" and of such St. John saith, "He that bids them God speed, is partaker of their evil deeds."

To the P O S T S C R I P T.

Remonst. A goodly Pasquin borrow'd for a great part out of Sion's plea, or the breviary consisting of a rhapsody of histories.

Answ. How wittily you tell us what your wonted course is upon the like occasion: the collection was taken, be it known to you, from as authentic authors in this kind, as any in a bishop's library; and the collector of it says moreover, that if the like occasion come again, he shall less need the help of breviaries, or historical rhapsodies, than your reverence to eke out your sermonings shall need repair to Postils, or Polianthea's.

Remonst. They were bishops, you say, true, but they were popish bishops.

Answ. Since you would bind us to your jurisdiction by their canon law, since you would enforce upon us the old riff-raff of Sarum, and other monastical reliques; since you live upon their unjust purchases, alledge their authorities, boast of their succession, walk

walk in their steps, their pride, their titles, their covetousness, their persecuting of God's people; since you disclaim their actions, and build their sepulchres, it is most just, that all their faults should be imputed to you, and their iniquities visited upon you.

Remonst. Could you see no colleges, no hospitals built?

Answ. At that primero of piety, the pope and cardinals are the better gamesters, and will cog a die into heaven before you.

Remonst. No churches re-edify'd?

Answ. Yes, more churches than souls.

Remonst. No learned volumes writ?

Answ. So did the miscreant bishop of Spalatto write learned volumes against the pope, and run to Rome when he had done: ye write them in your closets, and unwrite them in your courts; hot volumists and cold bishops; a swash-buckler against the pope, and a dormouse against the devil, while the whole diocese be sown with tares, and none to resist the enemy, but such as let him in at the postern; a rare superintendent at Rome, and a cypher at home. Hypocrites! the gospel faithfully preached to the poor, the desolate parishes visited and duly fed; loiterers thrown out, wolves driven from the fold, had been a better confutation of the pope and mass, than whole hecatontomes of controversies; and all this careering with spear in rest, and thundring upon the steel cap of Baronius or Bel-larmine.

Remonst. No seduced persons reclaimed?

Answ. More reclaimed persons seduc'd.

Remonst. No hospitality kept?

Answ. Bacchanalia's good store in every bishop's family, and good gleeking.

Remonst. No great offenders punish'd?

Answ. The trophies of your high commission are renown'd.

Remonst. No good offices done for the public?

Answ. Yes, the good office of reducing monarchy to tyranny, of breaking pacifications, and calumniating the people to the king.

Remonst. No care of the peace of the church?

Answ. No, nor of the land; witness the two armies in the North, that now lies plunder'd, and over-run by a liturgy.

Remonst. No diligence in preaching?

Answ. Scarce any preaching at all.

Remonst. No holiness in living?

Answ. No.

Remonst. Truly, brethren, I can say no more, but that the fault is in your eyes.

Answ. If you can say no more than this, you were a proper Remonstrant to stand up for the whole tribe!

Remonst. Wipe them, and look better.

Answ. Wipe your fat corpulencies out of our light.

Remonst. Yea, I beseech God to open them rather that they may see good.

Answ. If you mean good prelates, let be your prayer, ask not impossibilities.

Remonst. As for that proverb, the bishop's foot hath been in it, it were more fit for a Scurra in Trivio, or some ribald upon an ale-bench.

Answ. The fitter for them then of whom it was meant.

Remonst. I doubt not but they will say, the bishop's foot hath been in your book, for I am sure it is quite spoiled by this just confutation; for your proverb, Sapit ollam.

Answ. Spoil'd, quoth ye? indeed it is so spoil'd, as a good song is spoil'd by a lewd finger; or, as the saying is, "God sends meat, but the cooks work their wills:" in that sense we grant your bishop's foot may have spoil'd it, and made it "Sapere ollam," if not "Sapere aulam;" which is the same in old Latin, and perhaps in plain English. For certain your confutation hath atchieved nothing against it, and left nothing upon it, but

a foul taste of your skillet foot, and a more perfect and distinguishable odour of your socks, than of your night-cap. And how the bishop should confute a book with his foot, unless his brains were dropt into his great toe, I cannot meet with any man that can resolve me; only they tell me that certainly such a confutation must needs be gouty. So much for the bishop's foot.

Remonst. You tell us of Bonner's broth; it is the fashion in some countries to send in their keal in the last service, and this it seems is the manner amongst our Smeectymnuans.

Answ. Your latter service at the high altar you mean: but soft, Sir, the feast was but begun, the broth was your own, you have been inviting the land to it this fourscore years; and so long we have been your slaves to serve it up for you, much against our wills: we know you have the beef to it, ready in your kitchens, we are sure it was almost sod before this parliament begun; what direction you have given since to your cooks to set it by in the pantry till some fitter time, we know not, and therefore your dear jest is lost; this broth was but your first service: alas, Sir, why do you delude your guests? Why do not those goodly flanks and briskets march up in your stately chargers? Doubtless, if need be, the pope that owes you for mollifying the matter so well with him, and making him a true church, will furnish you with all the fat oxen of Italy.

Remonst. Learned and worthy Doctor Moulin shall tell them.

Answ. Moulin says in his book of the calling of pastors, that because bishops were the reformers of the English church, therefore they were left remaining: this argument is but of small force to keep you in your cathedrals. For first it may be denied that bishops were our first reformers, for Wickliffe was before them, and his egregious labours are not to be neglected: besides, our bishops were in this work but the disciples of priests, and began the reformation before they were bishops. But what though Luther and other monks were the reformers of other places? does it follow therefore that monks ought to continue? No, though Luther had taught so. And lastly, Moulin's argument directly makes against you; for if there be nothing in it but this, bishops were left remaining because they were reformers of the church, by as good a consequence therefore they are now to be removed, because they have been the most certain deformaters and ruiners of the church. Thus you see how little it avails you to take sanctuary among those churches which in the general scope of your actions formerly you have disregarded, and despised; however, your fair words would now smooth it over otherwise.

Remonst. Our bishops, some whereof being crowned with martyrdom, subscribed the gospel with their blood.

Answ. You boast much of martyrs to uphold your episcopacy; but if you would call to mind what Eusebius in his 5th book recites from Apollinarius of Hierapolis, you should then hear it esteemed no other than an old heretical argument, to prove a position true, because some that held it were martyrs: this was that which gave boldness to the Marcionists and Cataphryges to avouch their impious heresies for pious doctrine, because they could reckon many martyrs of their sect; and when they were confuted in other points, this was ever their last and stoutest plea.

Remonst. In the mean time I beseech the God of heaven to humble you.

Answ. We shall beseech the same God to give you a more profitable and pertinent humiliation than yet you know, and a less mistaken charitableness, with that peace which you have hitherto so perversely misaffected.

A N
A P O L O G Y
F O R
S M E C T Y M N U U S.

IF, readers, to that same great difficulty of well-doing what we certainly know, were not added in most men as great a carelessness of knowing what they and others ought to do, we had been long ere this, no doubt but all of us, much farther on our way to some degree of peace and happiness in this kingdom. But since our sinful neglect of practising that which we know to be undoubtedly true and good, hath brought forth among us, through God's just anger, so great a difficulty now to know that which otherwise might be soon learnt, and hath divided us by a controversy of great importance indeed, but of no hard solution, which is the more our punishment; I resolv'd (of what small moment soever I might be thought) to stand on that side where I saw both the plain authority of scripture leading, and the reason of justice and equity persuading; with this opinion, which esteems it more unlike a christian to be a cold neuter in the cause of the Church, than the law of Solon made it punishable after a sedition in the state. And because I observe that fear and dull disposition, lukewarmness and sloth, are not seldomer wont to cloak themselves under the affected name of moderation, than true and lively zeal is customably disparag'd with the term of indiscretion, bitterness, and choler; I could not to my thinking honour a good cause more from the heart, than by defending it earnestly, as oft as I could judge it to behoove me, notwithstanding any false name that could be invented to wrong or undervalue an honest meaning. Wherein although I have not doubted to single forth more than once such of them as were thought the chief and most nominated opposers on the other side, whom no man else undertook; if I have done well either to be confident of the truth, whose force is best seen against the ablest resistance, or to be jealous and tender of the hurt that might be done among the weaker by the intrapping authority of great names titled to false opinions; or that it be lawful to attribute somewhat to gifts of God's imparting, which I boast not, but thankfully acknowledge, and fear also lest at my certain account they be reckoned to me rather many than few; or if lastly it be but justice not to defraud of due esteem the wearisome labours and studious watchings, wherein I have spent and tired out almost a whole youth, I shall not distrust to be acquitted of presumption: knowing, that if heretofore all ages have received with favour and good acceptance the early industry of him that hath been hopeful, it were but hard measure now, if the freedom of any timely spirit should be oppressed meerly by the big and blunted fame of his elder adversary; and that his sufficiency must be now sentenced, not by pondering the reason he shews, but by calculating the years he brings. However, as my purpose is not, nor hath been formerly, to look on my adversary abroad, through the deceiving glass of other men's great opinion of him, but at home, where I may find him in the proper light of his own worth; so now against the rancour of an evil tongue, from which I never thought so absurdly, as that I of all men should be exempt, I must be forc'd to proceed from the unfeigned and diligent inquiry of my own conscience at home (for better way I know not, readers) to give a more true account of myself abroad than this modest confuter, as he calls himself, hath given of me. Albeit,

that in doing this I shall be sensible of two things which to me will be nothing pleasant; the one is, that not unlikely I shall be thought too much a party in mine own cause, and therein to see least: the other, that I shall be put unwillingly to molest the public view with the vindication of a private name; as if it were worth the while that the people should care whether such a one were thus, or thus. Yet those I intreat who have found the leisure to read that name, however of small repute, unworthily defamed, would be so good and so patient as to hear the same person not unneedfully defended. I will not deny but that the best apology against false accusers is silence and sufferance, and honest deeds set against dishonest words. And that I could at this time most easily and securely, with the least loss of reputation, use no other defence, I need not despair to win belief; whether I consider both the foolish contriving and ridiculous aiming of these his slanderous bolts, shot so wide of any suspicion to be fasten'd on me, that I have oft with inward contentment perceived my friends congratulating themselves in my innocence, and my enemies ashamed of their partners folly: or whether I look at these present times wherein most men, now scarce permitted the liberty to think over their own concerns, have removed the seat of their thoughts more outward to the expectation of public events. Or whether the examples of men, either noble or religious, who have sat down lately with a meek silence and sufferance under many libellous endorsements, may be a rule to others, I might well appease myself to put up any reproaches in such an honourable society of fellow-sufferers, using no other defence. And were it that slander would be content to make an end where it first fixes, and not seek to cast out the like infamy upon each thing that hath but any relation to the person traduced, I should have pleaded against this confuter by no other advocates than those which I first commended, silence and sufferance, and speaking deeds against faltering words. But when I discerned his intent was not so much to smite at me, as through me to render odious the truth which I had written, and to stain with ignominy that evangelic doctrine which opposes the tradition of prelaty; I conceived myself to be now not as mine own person, but as a member incorporate into that truth whereof I was persuaded, and whereof I had declared openly to be a partaker. Whereupon I thought it my duty, if not to myself, yet to the religious cause I had in hand, not to leave on my garment the least spot, or blemish in good name, so long as God should give me to say that which might wipe it off. Lest those disgraces which I ought to suffer, if it so befall me, for my religion, through my default religion be made liable to suffer for me. And, whether it might not something reflect upon those reverent men whose friend I may be thought in writing the animadversions, was not my last care to consider; if I should rest under these reproaches, having the same common adversary with them, it might be counted small credit for their cause to have found such an assistant, as this babbler hath devised me. What other thing in his book there is of dispute or question, in answering thereto I doubt not to be justified; except there be who will condemn me to have wasted time in throwing down that which could not keep itself up. As for others, who notwithstanding what I can alledge have yet decreed to misinterpret the intents of my reply, I suppose they would have found as many causes to have mis-conceived the reasons of my silence.

TO begin therefore an apology for those animadversions which I writ against the Remonstrant in defence of Smectymnuus; since the preface, which was purposely set before them, is not thought apologetical enough, it will be best to acquaint ye, readers, before other things, what the meaning was to write them in that manner which I did. For I do not look to be asked wherefore I writ the book, it being no difficulty to answer that I did it to those ends which the best men propose to themselves when they write: But wherefore in that manner, neglecting the main bulk of all that specious antiquity, which might stun children, but not men, I chose rather to observe some kind of military advantages to await him at his forragings, at his waterings, and whenever he felt

felt himself secure, to solace his vein in derision of his more serious opponents. And here let me have pardon, readers, if the remembrance of that which he hath licenced himself to utter contemptuously of those reverend men, provoke me to do that over again which some expect I should excuse as too freely done; since I have two provocations, his latest insulting in his short answer, and their final patience. I had no fear but that the authors of Smectymnus, to all the shew of solidity which the remonstrant could bring, were prepared both with skill and purpose to return a sufficing answer, and were able enough to lay the dust and pudder in antiquity, which he and his, out of stratagem, are wont to raise; but when I saw his weak arguments headed with sharp taunts, and that his design was, if he could not refute them, yet at least with quips and snapping adagies to vapour them out, which they bent only upon the business were minded to let pass; by how much I saw them taking little thought for their own injuries, I must confess I took it as my part the less to endure that my respected friends, through their own unnecessary patience, should thus lie at the mercy of a coy flurting stile; to be girded with frumps and curtall gibes, by one who makes sentences by the statute, as if all above three inches long were confiscate. To me it seem'd an indignity, that whom his whole wisdom could not move from their place, them his impetuous folly should presume to ride over. And if I were more warm than was meet in any passage of that book, which yet I do not yield, I might use therein the patronage of no worse an author than Gregory Nyssen, who mentioning his sharpness against Eunomius in the defence of his brother Basil, holds himself irreprovable in that "it was not for himself, but in the cause of his brother; and in such cases," saith he, "perhaps it is worthier pardon to be angry than to be cooler." And whereas this confuter taxes the whole discourse of levity, I shall shew ye, readers, where-soever it shall be objected in particular, that I have answer'd with as little lightness as the Remonstrant hath given example. I have not been so light as the palm of a Bishop, which is the lightest thing in the world when he brings out his book of ordination: For then, contrary to that which is wont in releasing out of prison, any one that will pay his fees is laid hands on. Another reason, it would not be amiss though the Remonstrant were told, wherefore he was in that unusual manner beleaguerr'd; and this was it, to pluck out of the heads of his admirers the conceit that all who are not prelatical, are gross-headed, thick-witted, illiterate, shallow. Can nothing then but Episcopacy teach men to speak good English, to pick and order a set of words judiciously? Must we learn from canons and quaint sermonings, interlin'd with barbarous Latin, to illumine a period, to wreath an enthymema with masterous dexterity? I rather incline, as I have heard it observ'd, that a Jesuit's Italian when he writes, is ever naught, though he be born and bred a Florentine; so to think that from like causes we may go near to observe the same in the stile of a Prelate. For doubtless that indeed according to art is most eloquent, which turns and approaches nearest to nature from whence it came; and they express nature best, who in their lives least wander from her safe leading, which may be call'd regenerate reason. So that how he should be truly eloquent who is not withal a good man, I see not. Nevertheless, as oft as is to be dealt with men who pride themselves in their supposed art, to leave them inexcusable wherein they will not be bettered; there be of those that esteem Prelaty a figment, who yet can pipe if they can dance, nor will be unfurnish'd to shew that what the Prelates admire and have not, others have and admire not. The knowledge whereof, and not of that only, but of what the Scripture teacheth us how we ought to withstand the perverters of the Gospel, were those other motives which gave the animadversions no leave to remit a continual vehemence throughout the book. For as in teaching doubtless the spirit of meekness is most powerful, so are the meek only fit persons to be taught: as for the proud, the obstinate, and false doctors of men's devices, be taught they will not, but discovered and laid open they must be. For how can they admit of teaching, who have the condemnation of God already upon them for refusing divine instruction? That is, to be fill'd with their own devices, as in the

Proverbs we may read : therefore we may safely imitate the method that God uses ; “ with the froward to be froward, and to throw scorn upon the scorner,” whom, if any thing, nothing else will heal. And if the “ righteous shall laugh at the destruction of the ungodly,” they may also laugh at their pertinacious and incurable obstinacy, and at the same time be mov’d with detestation of their seducing malice, who employ all their wits to defend a Prelaty usurp’d, and to deprave that just government which pride and ambition, partly by fine fetches and pretences, partly by force, hath shouldered out of the Church. And against such kind of deceivers openly and earnestly to protest, lest any one should be inquisitive wherefore this or that man is forwarder than others, let him know that this office goes not by age or youth, but to whomsoever God shall give apparently the will, the spirit and the utterance. Ye have heard the reasons for which I thought not myself exempted from associating with good men in their labours toward the Church’s welfare : to which, if any one brought opposition, I brought my best resistance. If in requital of this, and for that I have not been negligent toward the reputation of my friends, I have gain’d a name bestuck, or as I may say, bedeck’d with the reproaches and reviles of this modest confuter ; it shall be to me neither strange nor unwelcome, as that which could not come in a better time.

Having render’d an account what induc’d me to write those animadversions in that manner as I writ them, I come now to see what the confutation hath to say against them ; but so as the confuter shall hear first what I have to say against his confutation. And because he pretends to be a great conjector at other men by their writings, I will not fail to give ye, readers, a present taste of him from his title, hung out like a tolling sign post to call passengers, not simply a confutation, but “ a modest confutation,” with a laudatory of itself obtruded in the very first word. Whereas a modest title should only inform the buyer what the book contains without further insinuation ; this officious epithet so hastily assuming the modesty which others are to judge of by reading, not the author to anticipate to himself by forestalling, is a strong presumption that his modesty set there to sale in the frontispiece, is not much addicted to blush. A surer sign of his lost shame he could not have given, than seeking thus unseasonably to prepossess men of his modesty. And seeing he hath neither kept his word in the sequel, nor omitted any kind of boldness in slandering, ’tis manifest his purpose was only to rub the forehead of his title with this word modest, that he might not want colour to be the more impudent throughout his whole confutation. Next, what can equally favour of injustice and plain arrogance, as to prejudice and forecondemn his adversary in the title for “ slanderous and scurrilous,” and as the Remonstrants fashion is, for frivolous, tedious, and false, not staying till the reader can hear him prov’d so in the following discourse ? Which is one cause of a suspicion that in setting forth this pamphlet the remonstrant was not unconsulted with : thus his first address was “ an humble remonstrance by a dutiful son of the Church,” almost as if he had said, her white-boy. His next was, “ a Defence” (a wonder how it escap’d some praising adjunct “ against the frivolous and false exceptions of Smeectymnuus,” sitting in the chair of his title-page upon his poor cast adversaries both as a judge and party, and that before the jury of readers can be impannell’d. His last was “ a short answer to a tedious vindication ;” so little can he suffer a man to measure either with his eye or judgment, what is short or what tedious, without his preoccupying direction : and from hence is begotten this “ modest confutation against a slanderous and scurrilous libel.” I conceive, readers, much may be guess’d at the man and his book, what depth there is, by the framing of his title ; which being in this remonstrant so rash and unadvised as ye see, I conceit him to be near a-kin to him who set forth a passion sermon with a formal dedicatory in great letters to our Saviour. Although I know that all we do ought to begin and end to his praise and glory, yet to inscribe him in a void place with flourishes, as a man in compliment uses to trick up the name of some esquire, gentleman, or lord paramount at common law, to be his book-patron, with the appendant form of a ceremonious presentment, will ever appear among the judicious to be but an insulfe and frigid affectation.

fection. As no less was that before his book against the Brownists, to write a letter to a *Protopopœia*, a certain rhetoriz'd woman whom he calls mother, and complains of some that laid whoredom to her charge; and certainly had he folded his epistle with a superscription to be deliver'd to that female figure by any post or carrier who were not a ubiquitary, it had been a most miraculous greeting. We find the primitive doctors as oft as they writ to Churches, speaking to them as to a number of faithful brethren and sons, and not to make a cloudy transmigration of sexes in such a familiar way of writing as an epistle ought to be, leaving the track of common address, to run up, and tread the air in metaphorical compellations, and many fond utterances better let alone. But I step again to this emblazoner of his title-page, (whether it be the same man or no, I leave it in the midst) and here I find him pronouncing, without reprieve, those animadversions to be a slanderous and scurrilous libel. To which I, readers, that they are neither slanderous, nor scurrilous, will answer in what place of his book he shall be found with reason, and not ink only in his mouth. Nor can it be a libel more than his own, which is both nameless and full of slanders; and if in this that it freely speaks of things amiss in religion, but establish'd by act of state, I see not how Wickliffe and Luther, with all the first martyrs and reformers, could avoid the imputation of libelling. I never thought the human frailty of erring in cases of religion, infamy to a state, no more than to a council: it had therefore been neither civil nor christianly, to derogate the honour of the state for that cause, especially when I saw the parliament itself piously and magnanimously bent to supply and reform the defects and oversights of their fore-fathers, which to the godly and repentant ages of the Jews were often matter of humble confessing and bewailing, not of confident asserting and maintaining. Of the state therefore I found good reason to speak all honourable things, and to join in petition with good men that petition'd: but against the Prelates who were the only seducers and mis-leaders of the state to constitute the government of the Church not rightly, methought I had not vehemence enough. And thus, readers, by the example which he hath set me, I have given ye two or three notes of him out of his title-page; by which his firstlings fear not to guess boldly at his whole lump, for that guess will not fail ye; and although I tell him keen truth, yet he may bear with me, since I am like to chase him into some good knowledge, and others, I trust, shall not mis-spend their leisure. For this my aim is, if I am forc'd to be displeasing to him whose fault it is, I shall not forget at the same time to be useful in some thing to the stander-by.

As therefore he began in the title, so in the next leaf he makes it his first business to tamper with his reader by sycophanting and mis-naming the work of his adversary. He calls it "a mime thrust forth upon the stage to make up the breaches of those solemn scenes between the Prelates and the Smectymnians." Wherein while he is so over-greedy to fix a name of ill sound upon another, note how stupid he is to expose himself or his own friends to the same ignominy; likening those grave controversies to a piece of stagery, or scene-work, where his own remonstrant, whether in buskin or sock, must of all right be counted the chief player, be it boasting Thraso, or Davus that troubles all things, or one who can shift into any shape, I meddle not; let him explicate who hath resembled the whole argument to a comedy, for "Tragical," he says, "were too ominous." Nor yet doth he tell us what a mime is, whereof we have no pattern from ancient writers, except some fragments, which contain many acute and wise sentences. And this we know in Laertius, that the mimes of Sophron were of such reckoning with Plato, as to take them nightly to read on, and after make them his pillow. Scaliger describes a mime to be a poem imitating any action to stir up laughter. But this being neither poem, nor yet ridiculous, how is it but abusively tax'd to be a mime? for if every book which may by chance excite to laugh here and there, must be term'd thus, then may the dialogues of Plato, who for those his writings hath obtain'd the surname of divine, be esteemed as they are by that detractor in Athenæus, no better than Mimes. Because there is scarce

one of them, especially wherein some notable sophister lies sweating and turmoiling under the inevitable and merciless dilemma's of Socrates, but that he who reads, were it Saturn himself, would be often robb'd of more than a smile. And whereas he tells us that "scurrilous Mime was a personated grim lowring fool," his foolish language unwittingly writes fool upon his own friend, for he who was there Personated, was only the Remonstrant; the author is ever distinguished from the person he introduces. But in an ill hour hath this unfortunate rashness stumbled upon the mention of miming, that he might at length cease, which he hath not yet since he stepped in, to gall and hurt him whom he would aid. Could he not beware, could he not bethink him, was he so uncircumspect, as not to foresee, that no sooner would that word Mime be set eye on in the paper, but it would bring to mind that wretched pilgrimage over Minshew's dictionary call'd "Mundus alter & idem," the idlest and the paltriest mime that ever mounted upon bank? Let him ask "the author of those toothless satyrs" who was the maker, or rather the anticreator of that universal foolery, who he was, who like that other principle of the Manichees the Arch evil one, when he had look'd upon all that he had made and mapped out, could say no other but contrary to the divine mouth, that it was all very foolish. That grave and noble invention which the greatest and sublimest wits in sundry ages, Plato in Critias, and our two famous countrymen, the one in his "Utopia," the other in his "new Atlantis" chose, I may not say as a field, but as a mighty continent, wherein to display the largeness of their spirits, by teaching this our world better and exacter things than were yet known or used: this petty prevaricator of America, the zany of Columbus (for so he must be till his world's end) having rambled over the huge topography of his own vain thoughts, no marvel if he brought us home nothing but a meer tankard drollery, a venereous parjetory for a stew. Certainly, he that could endure with a sober pen to sit and devise laws for drunkards to carouse by, I doubt me whether the very soberness of such a one, like an unlicour'd Silenus, were not stark drunk. Let him go now and brand another man injuriously with the name of Mime, being himself the loosest and most extravagant Mime that hath been heard of, whom no less than almost half the world could serve for stage-room to play the Mime in. And let him advise again with Sir Francis Bacon, whom he cites to confute others, what it is to "turn the sins of Christendom into a mimical mockery, to rip up the saddest vices with a laughing countenance," especially where neither reproof nor better teaching is adjoined. Nor is my meaning, readers, to shift off a blame from myself, by charging the like upon my accuser, but shall only desire that sentence may be respited, till I can come to some instance whereto I may give answer.

Thus having spent his first onset, not in confuting, but in a reasonless defaming of the book, the method of his malice hurries him to attempt the like against the author; not by proofs and testimonies, but "having no certain notice of me," as he professes, "further than what he gathers from the animadversions," blunders at me for the rest, and flings out stray crimes at a venture; which he could never, though he be a serpent, suck from any thing that I have written, but from his own stuffed magazine, and hoard of slanderous inventions, over and above that which he converted to venom in the drawing. To me, readers, it happens as a singular contentment; and let it be to good men no slight satisfaction, that the slanderer here confesses, he has "no further notice of me than his own conjecture." Although it had been honest to have inquir'd, before he utter'd such infamous words, and I am credibly inform'd he did inquire; but finding small comfort from the intelligence which he receiv'd, whereon to ground the falsities which he had provided, thought it his likeliest course under a pretended ignorance to let drive at random, lest he should lose his odd ends, which from some penurious book of characters he had been culling out and would fain apply. Not caring to burden me with those vices, whereof, among whom my conversation hath been, I have been ever least suspected; perhaps not without some subtlety to cast me into envy, by bringing on me a necessity

fity to enter into mine own praises. In which argument I know every wise man is more unwillingly drawn to speak, than the most repining ear can be averse to hear. Nevertheless, since I dare not wish to pass this life unpersecuted of slanderous tongues, for God hath told us that to be generally prais'd is woeful, I shall rely on his promise to free the innocent from causeless aspersions: whereof nothing sooner can assure me, than if I shall feel him now assisting me in the just vindication of myself, which yet I could defer, it being more meet that to those other matters of public debatement in this book, I should give attendance first, but that I fear it would but harm the truth for me to reason in her behalf, so long as I should suffer my honest estimation to lie unpurg'd from these insolent suspicions. And if I shall be large, or unwonted in justifying myself to those who know me not, for else it would be needless, let them consider that a short slander will oft-times reach further than a long apology; and that he who will do justly to all men, must begin from knowing how, if it so happen, to be not unjust to himself. I must be thought, if this libeller, (for now he shews himself to be so) can find belief, after an inordinate and riotous youth spent at the University, to have been at length "vomited out thence." For which commodious lie, that he may be encouraged in the trade another time, I thank him; for it hath given me an apt occasion to acknowledge publickly with all grateful mind, that more than ordinary favour and respect which I found above any of my equals at the hands of those courteous and learned men, the fellows of that college wherein I spent some years: who at my parting, after I had taken two degrees, as the manner is, signify'd many ways, how much better it would content them that I would stay; as by many letters full of kindness and loving respect, both before that time, and long after, I was assur'd of their singular good affection towards me. Which being likewise propense to all such as were for their studious and civil life worthy of esteem, I could not wrong their judgments, and upright intentions, so much as to think I had that regard from them for other cause than that I might be still encouraged to proceed in the honest and laudable courses, of which they apprehended I had given good proof. And to those ingenuous and friendly men, who were ever the countenancers of virtuous and hopeful wits, I wish the best and happiest things that friends in absence wish one to another. As for the common approbation or dislike of that place, as now it is, that I should esteem or disesteem myself, or any other the more for that; too simple and too credulous is the confuter, if he think to obtain with me, or any right discerners. Of small practice were that physician, who could not judge by what both she or her sister hath of long time vomited, that the worser stuff she strongly keeps in her stomach, but the better she is ever kecking at, and is queasy. She vomits now out of sickness; but ere it will be well with her, she must vomit by strong physic. In the mean while that Suburb sink, as this rude scavenger calls it, and more than scurrilously taunts it with the Plague, having a worse plague in his middle entrail, that suburb wherein I dwell, shall be in my account a more honourable place than his university. Which as in the time of her better health, and mine own younger judgment, I never greatly admired, so now much less. But he follows me to the city, still usurping and forging beyond his book notice, which only he affirms to have had; "and where my morning haunts are, he wisses not." 'Tis wonder, that being so rare an alchymist of slander, he could not extract that, as well as the university vomit, and the suburb sink which his art could distil so cunningly; but because his limbec fails him, to give him and envy the more vexation, I'll tell him. Those morning haunts are where they should be, at home; not sleeping, or concocting the surfeits of an irregular feast, but up and stirring, in winter often ere the sound of any bell awake men to labour, or to devotion; in summer as oft with the bird that first rouses, or not much tardier, to read good authors, or cause them to be read, till the attention be weary, or memory have its full fraught: Then with useful and generous labours preserving the body's health and hardiness; to render lightsome, clear, and not lumpish obedience to the mind, to the

cause of religion, and our country's liberty, when it shall require firm hearts in sound bodies to stand and cover their stations, rather than to see the ruin of our protestation, and the inforcement of a slavish life. These are the morning practices: proceed now to the afternoon; in Playhouses," he says, "and the Bordelloes." Your intelligence, unfaithful spy of Canaan? He gives in his evidence, that "there he hath trac'd me." Take him at his word, readers, but let him bring good sureties ere ye dismiss him, that while he pretended to dog others, he did not turn in for his own pleasure: for so much in effect he concludes against himself, not contented to be caught in every other gin, but he must be such a novice, as to be still hampered in his own hemp. In the animadversions, saith he, I find the mention of old cloaks, false beards, night-walkers, and salt lotion; therefore the animadverter haunts playhouses and bordelloes; for if he did not, how could he speak of such gear? Now that he may know what it is to be a child, and yet to meddle with edg'd tools, I turn his Antistrephon upon his own head; the confuter knows that these things are the furniture of playhouses and bordelloes, therefore by the same reason "the confuter himself hath been trac'd in those places." Was it such a dissolute speech, telling of some politicians who were wont to eavesdrop in disguises, to say they were often liable to a night-walking cudgeller, or the emptying of a urinal? What if I had writ as your friend the author of the aforesaid Mime, "Mundus alter & idem," to have been ravished like some young Cephalus or Hylas, by a troop of camping housewives in Viraginea, and that he was there forced to swear himself an uxorious varlet; then after a long servitude to have come into Aphrodisia that pleasant country, that gave such a sweet smell to his nostrils among the shameless courtezans of Desvergonia? Surely he would have then concluded me as constant at the Bordello, as the galley-slave at his oar. But since there is such necessity to the hear-say of a tire, a periwig, or a vizard, that plays must have been seen, what difficulty was there in that? when in the colleges so many of the young divines, and those in next aptitude to divinity have been seen so often upon the stage, writhing and unboning their Clergy-limbs to all the antic and dishonest gestures of trinculo's, buffoons, and bawds; prostituting the shame of that ministry, which either they had, or were nigh having, to the eyes of courtiers and court-ladies, with their Grooms and Madamoiselles. There while they acted, and over-acted, among other young scholars, I was a spectator; they thought themselves gallant men, and I thought them fools; they made sport, and I laugh'd; they mispronounc'd, and I mislik'd; and to make up the Atticism, they were out, and I hift. Judge now whether so many good text-men were not sufficient to instruct me of false beards and vizards, without more expositors: and how can this confuter take the face to object to me the seeing of that which his reverend prelates allow, and incite their young disciples to act? For if it be unlawful to sit and behold a mercenary comedian personating that which is least unseemly for a hireling to do, how much more blameful is it to endure the sight of as vile things acted by persons either enter'd, or presently to enter into the ministry; and how much more foul and ignominious for them to be the actors?

But because as well by this upbraiding to me the bordello's, as by other suspicious glancings in his book, he would seem privily to point me out to his readers, as one whose custom of life were not honest, but licentious; I shall intreat to be born with, though I digress; and in a way not often trod, acquaint ye with the sum of my thoughts in this matter, through the course of my years and studies. Although I am not ignorant how hazardous it will be to do this under the nose of the envious, as it were in skirmish to change the compact order, and instead of outward actions, to bring inmost thoughts into front. And I must tell ye, readers, that by this sort of men I have been already bitten at; yet shall they not for me know how slightly they are esteem'd, unless they have so much learning as to read what in Greek *Απειροκαλία* is, which together with envy, is the common disease of those who censure books that are not for their reading.

With me it fares now, as with him whose outward garment hath been injured and ill-bedighted; for having no other shift, what help but to turn the inside outwards, especially if the lining be of the same, or, as it is sometimes, much better? so if my name and outward demeanour be not evident enough to defend me, I must make trial, if the discovery of my inmost thoughts can: Wherein of two purposes both honest, and both sincere, the one perhaps I shall not miss; although I fail to gain belief with others, of being such as my perpetual thoughts shall here disclose me, I may yet not fail of success in persuading some to be such really themselves, as they cannot believe me to be more than what I fain. I had my time, readers, as others have, who have good learning bestow'd upon them, to be sent to those places, where the opinion was, it might be soonest attain'd; and as the manner is, was not unstudied in those authors which are most commended; whereof some were grave orators and historians, whose matter methought I lov'd indeed, but as my age then was, so I understood them; others were the smooth elegiac poets, whereof the schools are not scarce, whom both for the pleasing sound of their numerous writing, which in imitation I found most easy, and most agreeable to nature's part in me, and for their matter, which what it is, there be few who know not, I was so allured to read, that no recreation came to me better welcome: For that it was then those years with me which are excused, though they be least severe, I may be sav'd the labour to remember ye. Whence having observ'd them to account it the chief glory of their wit, in that they were ablest to judge, to praise, and by that could esteem themselves worthiest to love those high perfections, which under one or other name they took to celebrate; I thought with myself by every instinct and presage of nature, which is not wont to be false, that what imboldned them to this task, might with such diligence as they us'd imbolden me; and that what judgment, wit, or elegance was my share, would herein best appear, and best value itself, by how much more wisely, and with more love of virtue I should chuse (let rude ears be absent) the object of not unlike praises: For albeit these thoughts to some will seem virtuous and commendable, to others only pardonable, to a third sort perhaps idle; yet the mentioning of them now will end in serious. Nor blame it, readers, in those years to propose to themselves such a reward, as the noblest dispositions above other things in this life have sometimes preferr'd: whereof not to be sensible, when good and fair in one person meet, argues both a gross and shallow judgment, and withal an ungentle, and swainish breast. For by the firm settling of these persuasions, I became, to my best memory, so much a proficient, that if I found those authors any where speaking unworthy things of themselves, or unchaste of those names which before they had extolled; this effect it wrought with me, from that time forward their art I still applauded, but the men I deplor'd; and above them all, preferr'd the two famous renowners of Beatrice and Laura, who never write, but honour of them to whom they devote their verse, displaying sublime and pure thoughts, without transgression. And long it was not after, when I was confirmed in this opinion, that he who would not be frustrate of his hope to write well hereafter in laudable things, ought himself to be a true poem; that is, a composition and pattern of the best and honourablest things; not presuming to sing high praises of heroic men, or famous cities, unless he have in himself the experience and the practice of all that which is praise-worthy. These reasonings, together with a certain niceness of nature, an honest haughtiness, and self-esteem either of what I was, or what I might be, (which let envy call pride) and lastly that modesty, whereof though not in the title-page, yet here I may be excused to make some befitting profession; all these uniting the supply of their natural aid together, kept me still above those low descents of mind, beneath which he must deject and plunge himself, that can agree to saleable and unlawful prostitutions. Next, (for hear me out now readers) that I may tell ye whither my younger feet wander'd; I betook me among those lofty fables and romances, which recount in solemn canto's, the deeds of knighthood founded by our victorious kings, and from hence had

in renown over all Christendom: There I read it in the oath of every knight, that he should defend to the expence of his best blood, or of his life, if it so befel him, the honour and chastity of virgin or matron: from whence even then I learnt what a noble virtue chastity sure must be, to the defence of which so many worthies by such a dear adventure of themselves had sworn; and if I found in the story afterward, any of them by word or deed, breaking that oath, I judg'd it the same fault of the poet, as that which is attributed to Homer, to have written undecent things of the gods: only this my mind gave me, that every free and gentle spirit, without that oath, ought to be born a knight, nor needed to expect the gilt spur, or the laying of a sword upon his shoulder to stir him up both by his counsel and his arm, to secure and protect the weakness of any attempted chastity. So that even those books, which to many others have been the fuel of wantonness and loose living, I cannot think how, unless by divine indulgence, prov'd to me so many incitements, as you have heard, to the love and stedfast observation of that virtue which abhors the society of bordello's. Thus from the laureat fraternity of poets, riper years, and the ceaseless round of study and reading, led me to the shady spaces of philosophy; but chiefly to the divine volumes of Plato, and his equal Xenophon: where if I should tell ye what I learnt of Chastity and love, I mean that which is truly so, whose charming cup is only virtue, which she bears in her hand to those who are worthy; (the rest are cheated with a thick intoxicating potion, which a certain forcerefs, the abuser of love's name, carries about,) and how the first and chiefest office of love begins and ends in the soul, producing those happy twins of her divine generation, knowledge and virtue; with such abstracted sublimities as these, it might be worth your listning, readers, as I may one day hope to have ye in a still time, when there shall be no chiding; not in these noises, the adversary, as ye know, barking at the door, or searching for me at the bordello's, where it may be he has lost himself, and raps up without pity the sage and rheumatic old Prelates, with all her young Corinthian Laity, to inquire for such a one. Last of all, not in time, but as perfection is last, that care was ever had of me, with my earliest capacity, not to be negligently trained in the precepts of christian religion: this that I have hitherto related, hath been to shew, that though christianity had been but slightly taught me, yet a certain reservedness of natural disposition, and moral discipline, learnt out of the noblest philosophy, was enough to keep me in disdain of far less incontinences than this of the bordello. But having had the doctrine of holy scripture, unfolding those chaste and high mysteries, with timeliest care infused, that "the body is for the Lord, and the Lord for the body;" thus also I argued to myself, that if unchastity in a woman, whom St. Paul terms the glory of man, be such a scandal and dishonour, then certainly in a man, who is both the image and glory of God, it must, tho' commonly not so thought, be much more deflouring and dishonourable; in that he sins both against his own body, which is the perfecter sex, and his own glory which is in the woman; and that which is worst, against the image and glory of God which is in himself. Nor did I slumber over that place, expressing such high rewards of ever accompanying the Lamb, with those celestial songs to others inapprehensible, but not to those who were not defiled with women, which doubtless means fornication: for marriage must not be called a defilement. Thus large I have purposely been, that if I have been justly taxed with this crime, it may come upon me after all this my confession, with a ten-fold shame: but if I have hitherto deserved no such opprobrious word, or suspicion, I may hereby engage myself now openly to the faithful observation of what I have professed. I go on to shew you the unbridled impudence of this loose railer, who having once begun his race, regards not how far he flies out beyond all truth and shame; who from the single notice of the animadversions, as he protests, will undertake to tell ye the very cloaths I wear, though he be much mistaken in my wardrobe: and like a son of Belial, without the hire of Jesabel, charges me "of blaspheming God and the king," as ordinarily as he imagines "me to drink sack and swear," merely because this was a shred in his common-place book, and seem'd

seemed to come off roundly, as if he were some empirick of false accusations, to try his poisons upon me, whether they would work or no. Whom what should I endeavour to refute more, whenas that book which is his only testimony returns the lye upon him; not giving him the least hint of the author to be either a swearer, or a sack-drinker. And for the readers, if they can believe me, principally for those reasons which I have alledged, to be of life and purpose neither dishonest, nor unchaste, they will be easily induced to think me sober both of wine, and of word; but if I have been already successless in persuading them, all that I can further say, will be but vain; and it will be better thrift to save two tedious labours, mine of excusing, and theirs of needless hearing.

Proceeding further, I am met with a whole ging of words and phrases not mine, for he hath maim'd them, and like a fly depraver mangled them in this his wicked limbo, worse than the ghost of Deiphobus appear'd to his friend Æneas. Here I scarce know them, and he that would, let him repair to the place in that book where I set them: for certainly this tormentor of semicolons is as good at dismembring and flitting sentences, as his grave fathers the prelates have been at stigmatizing and flitting noses. By such handy-craft as this what might he not traduce? Only that odour which being his own must needs offend his sense of smelling, since he will needs bestow his foot among us, and not allow us to think he wears a sock, I shall endeavour it may be offenceless to other men's ears. The remonstrant having to do with grave and reverend men his adversaries, thought it became him to tell them in scorn, that "the bishop's foot had been in their book and confuted it;" which when I saw him arrogate, to have done that with his heels that surpass the best consideration of his head, to spurn a confutation among respected men, I questioned not the lawfulness of moving his jollity to bethink him, what odour a sock would have in such painful business. And this may have chanced to touch him more nearly than I was aware; for indeed a bishop's foot that hath all his toes maugre the gout, and a linen sock over it, is the aptest emblem of the prelate himself; who being a pluralist, may under one surplice, which is also linen, hide four benefices, besides the metropolitan toe, and sends a fouler stench to heaven than that which this young queasiness retches at. And this is the immediate reason here why our enraged confuter, that he may be as perfect an hypocrite as Cai-phas, ere he be a high priest, cries out, "Horrid blasphemy!" and like a recreant Jew, calls for Stones. I beseech ye, friends, ere the brick-bats fly, resolve me and yourselves, is it blasphemy, or any whit disagreeing from christian meekness, whenas Christ himself speaking of unfavoury traditions, scruples not to name the dunghill and the jakes, for me to answer a slovenly wincer of a confutation, that if he would needs put his foot to such a sweaty service, the odour of his sock was like to be neither musk, nor Benjamin? Thus did that foolish monk in a barbarous declamation accuse Petrarch of blasphemy for dispraising the French wines. But this which follows is plain Bedlam stuff, this is the Demoniac Legion indeed, which the Remonstrant feared had been against him, and now he may see is for him. "You that love Christ," saith he, "and know this miscreant wretch, stone him to death, lest you smart for his impunity." What thinks the remonstrant? does he like that such words as these should come out of his shop, out of his Trojan horse? to give the watch-word like a Guisian of Paris to a mutiny or massacre; to proclaim a Crusada against his fellow-christian now in this troublous and divided time of the kingdom? If he do, I shall say that to be the remonstrant, is no better than to be a jesuit; and that if he and his accomplices could do as the rebels have done in Ireland to the protestants, they would do in England the same to them that would no prelates. For a more seditious and butcherly speech no cell of Loyola could have belch'd against one who in all his writing spake not, that any man's skin should be rais'd. And yet this cursing Shimei, a hurler of stones, as well as a railer, wants not the face instantly to make as though he "despair'd of victory unless a modest defence would get it him." Did I err at all, readers, to foretel ye, when first I met with his title, that the epithet of modest there, was a certain red portending sign, that he meant ere long to be most tempestuously

tuously bold, and shameless? Nevertheless, "he dares not say but there may be hid in his nature as much venomous atheism and prophanation, as he thinks hath broke out at his adversary's lips; but he hath not the fore running upon him," as he would intimate "I have." Now trust me not, readers, if I be not already weary of pluming and footing this sea-gull, so open he lies to strokes, and never offers at another, but brings home the dorre upon himself. For if the fore be running upon me, in all judgment I have scap'd the disease; but he who hath as much hid in him, as he hath voluntarily confest, and cannot expel it, because he is dull, (for venomous atheism were no treasure to be kept within him else,) let him take the part he hath chosen, which must needs follow, to swell and burst with his own inward venom.

S E C T. I.

But mark, readers, there is a kind of justice observed among them that do evil, but this man loves injustice in the very order of his malice. For having all this while abused the good name of his adversary with all manner of licence in revenge of his remonstrant, if they be not both one person, or as I am told, Father and Son, yet after all this he calls for satisfaction, whenas he himself hath already taken the utmost farthing. "Violence hath been done," says he, "to the person of a holy and religious prelate." To which, something in effect to what St. Paul answer'd of Ananias, I answer, "I wist not brethren that he was a holy and religious Prelate; for evil is written of those who would be prelates. And finding him thus in disguise without his superscription or Phylactery either of holy or Prelate, it were no sin to serve him as Longchamp bishop of Ely was served in his disguise at Dover: he hath begun the measure nameless, and when he pleases we may all appear as we are. And let him be then what he will, he shall be to me so as I find him principled. For neither must prelate or arch-prelate hope to exempt himself from being reckoned as one of the vulgar, which is for him only to hope whom true wisdom and the contempt of vulgar opinions exempts, it being taught us in the psalms, that he who is in honour and understandeth not, is as the beasts that perish. And now first "the manner of handling that cause" which I undertook, he thinks is suspicious, as if the wisest, and the best words were not ever to some or other suspicious. But where is the offence, the disagreement from christian meekness, or the precept of Solomon in answering folly? When the remonstrant talks of froth and scum, I tell him there is none, and bid him spare his ladle: when he brings in the mess with Keal, Beef, and Brewes, what stomach in England could forbear to call for flanks and briskets? Capon and white broth having been likely sometimes in the same room with Christ and his apostles, why does it trouble him that it should be now in the same leaf, especially, where the discourse is not continued, but interrupt? And let him tell me, is he wont to say grace, doth he not then name holiest names over the steam of costliest superfluities? Does he judge it foolish or dishonest to write that among religious things, which when he talks of religious things, he can devoutly chew? Is he afraid to name Christ where those things are written in the same leaf, whom he fears not to name while the same things are in his mouth? Doth not Christ himself teach the highest things by the similitude of old bottles and patched cloaths? Doth he not illustrate best things by things most evil? his own coming to be as a thief in the night, and the righteous man's wisdom to that of an unjust steward? He might therefore have done better to have kept in his canting Beggars, and heathen Altar, to sacrifice his threadbare criticism of Bomolochus to an unseasonable goddess fit for him call'd importunity, and have reserved his Greek derivation till he lecture to his fresh men, for here his itching pedantry is but flouted.

But to the end that nothing may be omitted which may farther satisfy any conscionable man, who notwithstanding what I could explain before the animadversions, remains yet unsatisfied concerning that way of writing which I there defended, but this confuter whom it pinches, utterly disapproves; I shall assay once again, and perhaps with more

more success. If therefore the question were in oratory, whether a vehement vein throwing out indignation or scorn upon an object that merits it, were among the aptest Ideas of speech to be allowed, it were my work, and that an easy one, to make it clear both by the rules of best rhetoricians, and the famous examples of the Greek and Roman orations. But since the religion of it is disputed, and not the art, I shall make use only of such reasons and authorities, as religion cannot except against. It will be harder to gainsay, than for me to evince that in the teaching of men diversly-temper'd different ways are to be try'd. The baptist, we know, was a strict man, remarkable for austerity and set order of life. Our Saviour who had all gifts in him, was Lord to express his indoctrinating power in what sort him best seemed; sometimes by a mild and familiar converse, sometimes with plain and impartial home-speaking, regardless of those whom the auditors might think he should have had in more respect; otherwhiles with bitter and ireful rebukes, if not teaching, yet leaving excuseless those his wilful impugnors. What was all in him, was divided among many others the teachers of his church; some to be severe and ever of a sad gravity, that they may win such, and check sometimes those who be of nature over-confident and jocond; others were sent more cheartful, free, and still as it were at large, in the midst of an untrespassing honesty; that they who are so tempered, may have by whom they might be drawn to salvation, and they who are too scrupulous, and dejected of spirit, might be often strengthened with wise consolations and revivings: no man being forced wholly to dissolve that ground-work of nature which God created in him, the sanguine to empty out all his sociable liveliness, the cholerick to expel quite the unfinning predominance of his anger; but that each radical humour and passion wrought upon and corrected as it ought, might be made the proper mould and foundation of every man's peculiar gifts and virtues. Some also were indued with a staid moderation, and soundness of argument, to teach and convince the rational and sober-minded; yet not therefore that to be thought the only expedient course of teaching, for in times of opposition, when either against new heresies arising, or old corruptions to be reformed, this cool unpassionate mildness of positive wisdom is not enough to damp and astonish the proud resistance of carnal and false doctors, then (that I may have leave to soar a-while as the poets use) zeal, whose substance is ethereal, arming in compleat diamond, ascends his fiery chariot drawn with two blazing meteors figured like beasts, but of a higher breed than any the Zodiac yields, resembling two of those four which Ezekiel and St. John saw, the one visaged like a lion to express power, high authority, and indignation; the other of countenance like a man to cast derision and scorn upon perverse and fraudulent seducers: with these the invincible warrior zeal shaking loosely the slack reins drives over the heads of scarlet prelates, and such as are insolent to maintain traditions, bruising their stiff necks under his flaming wheels. Thus did the true prophets of old combat with the false; thus Christ himself, the fountain of meekness, found acrimony enough to be still galling and vexing the prelatical pharisees. But ye will say these had immediate warrant from God to be thus bitter; and I say, so much the plainlier is it proved, that there may be a sanctified bitterness against the enemies of truth. Yet that ye may not think inspiration only the warrant thereof, but that it is as any other virtue, of moral and general observation, the example of Luther may stand for all, whom God made choice of before others to be of highest eminence and power in reforming the church; who, not of revelation, but of judgment writ so vehemently against the chief defenders of old untruths in the Romish church, that his own friends and favourers were many times offended with the fierceness of his spirit; yet he being cited before Charles the Fifth to answer for his books, and having divided them into three sorts, whereof one was of those which he had sharply written, refused, though upon deliberation given him, to retract or unsay any word therein, as we may read in Sleidan. Yea, he defends his eagerness, as being "of an ardent spirit, and one who could not write a dull stile:" and affirmed, "he thought it God's will to have the inventions of men thus laid open, seeing that matters quietly handled

were quickly forgot." And herewithal how useful and available God had made this tart rhetoric in the church's cause, he often found by his own experience. For when he betook himself to lenity and moderation, as they call it, he reaped nothing but contempt both from Cajetan and Erasmus, from Cocleus, from Ecchius, and others; insomuch that blaming his friends who had so counsell'd him, he resolved never to run into the like error: if at other times he seem to excuse his vehemence, as more than what was meet, I have not examined through his works, to know how far he gave way to his own fervent mind; it shall suffice me to look to mine own. And this I shall easily aver, though it may seem a hard saying, that the spirit of God, who is purity itself, when he would reprove any fault severely, or but relate things done or said with indignation by others, abstains not from some words not civil at other times to be spoken. Omitting that place in Numbers at the killing of Zimri and Cosbi; done by Phineas in the height of zeal, related, as the Rabbins expound, not without an obscene word; we may find in Deuteronomy and three of the prophets, where God denouncing bitterly the punishments of idolaters, tells them in a term immodest to be uttered in cool blood, that their wives shall be defiled openly. But these, they will say, were honest words in that age when they were spoken. Which is more than any Rabbin can prove; and certainly had God been so minded, he could have picked such words as should never have come into abuse. What will they say to this? David going against Nabal, in the very same breath when he had just before named the name of God, he vows not "to leave any alive of Nabal's house that pisseth against the wall." But this was unadvisedly spoke, you will answer, and set down to aggravate his infirmity. Turn then to the first of Kings, where God himself uses the phrase, "I will cut off from Jeroboam him that pisseth against the wall." Which had it been an unseemly speech in the heat of an earnest expression, then we must conclude that Jonathan or Onkelos the Targumists were of cleaner language than he that made the tongue; for they render it as briefly, "I will cut off all who are at years of discretion," that is to say, so much discretion as to hide nakedness. Whereas God, who is the author both of purity and eloquence, chose this phrase as fittest in that vehement character wherein he spake. Otherwise that plain word might have easily been forborn: which the Masoreths and rabbinical Scholiasts not well attending, have often used to blur the margin with Keri instead of Ketiv, and gave us this insulse rule out of their Talmud, "That all words which in the law are writ obscenely, must be changed to more civil words:" fools who would teach men to read more decently than God thought good to write. And thus I take it to be manifest, that indignation against men and their actions notoriously bad, hath leave and authority oft-times to utter such words and phrases as in common talk were not so mannerly to use. That ye may know, not only as the historian speaks, "that all those things for which men plough, build, or sail; obey virtue," but that all words, and whatsoever may be spoken, shall at some time in an unwonted manner wait upon her purposes.

Now that the confutant may also know as he desires, what force of teaching there is sometimes in laughter; I shall return him in short, that laughter being one way of answering "a fool according to his folly," teaches two sorts of persons, first, the fool himself "not to be wise in his own conceit," as Solomon affirms; which is certainly a great document, to make an unwise man know himself. Next, it teacheth the hearers, in as much as scorn is one of those punishments which belong to men carnally wise, which is oft in scripture declared; for when such are punish'd, "the simple are thereby made wise," if Solomon's rule be true. And I would ask, to what end Eliah mocked the false prophets? was it to shew his wit, or to fulfil his humour? doubtless we cannot imagine that great servant of God had any other end in all which he there did, but to teach and instruct the poor misled people. And we may frequently read, that many of the martyrs in the midst of their troubles, were not sparing to deride and scoff their superstitious persecutors. Now may the confutant advise again with Sir Francis Bacon,

whether Eliah and the martyrs did well to turn religion into a comedy or satire; "to rip up the wounds of Idolatry and Superstition with a laughing countenance:" So that for pious gravity the author here is match'd and over-match'd, and for wit and morality in one that follows.

" —laughing to teach the truth
What hinders? as some teachers give to boys
Junkets and knacks, that they may learn apace."

Thus Flaccus in his first satyr, and his tenth:

" —Jesting decides great things
Stronglier, and better oft than earnest can."

I could urge the same out of Cicero and Seneca, but he may content him with this. And henceforward, if he can learn, may know as well what are the bounds, and objects of laughter and vehement reproof, as he hath known hitherto how to deserve them both. But lest some may haply think, or thus expostulate with me after all this debatement, who made you the busy almoner to deal about this dole of laughter and reprehension, which no man thanks your bounty for? To the urbanity of that man, I should answer much after this sort: That I, friend objecter, having read of heathen philosophers, some to have taught, that whosoever would but use his ear to listen, might hear the voice of his guiding Genius ever before him, calling, and as it were pointing to that way which is his part to follow; others, as the Stoics, to account reason, which they call the Hegemonicon, to be the common Mercury conducting without error those that give themselves obediently to be led accordingly: having read this, I could not esteem so poorly of the faith which I profess, that God had left nothing to those who had forsaken all other doctrines for his, to be an inward witness and warrant of what they have to do, as that they should need to measure themselves by other men's measures, how to give scope or limit to their proper actions; for that were to make us the most at a stand, the most uncertain and accidental wanderers in our doings, of all religions in the world. So that the question ere while moved, who he is that spends thus the benevolence of laughter and reproof so liberally upon such men as the prelates, may return with a more just demand, who he is not of place and knowledge never so mean, under whose contempt and jirk these men are not deservedly fallen? Neither can religion receive any wound by disgrace thrown upon the prelates, since religion and they surely were never in such amity. They rather are the men who have wounded religion, and their stripes must heal her. I might also tell them, what Electra in Sophocles, a wise virgin answered her wicked mother, who thought herself too violently reproved by her the daughter.

'Tis you that say it, not I; you do the deeds,
And your ungodly deeds find me the words.

If therefore the Remonstrant complain of libels, it is because he feels them to be right aim'd. For I ask again, as before in the animadversions, how long is it since he hath disrelish'd libels? We never heard the least mutter of his voice against them while they flew abroad without controul or check, defaming the Scots and Puritans. And yet he can remember of none but Lysimachus Nicanor, and "that he misliked and censur'd." No more but of one can the Remonstrant remember? What if I put him in mind of one more? What if of one more whereof the remonstrant in many likelihoods may be thought the author? Did he never see a pamphlet intitled after his own fashion, "A survey of that foolish, seditious, scandalous, prophane libel, the protestation protested?" The

child doth not more expressly refigure the visage of his father, than that book resembles the stile of the remonstrant, in those idioms of speech, wherein he seems most to delight: and in the seventeenth page three lines together are taken out of the remonstrance word for word, not as a citation, but as an author borrows from himself. Whoever it be, he may as justly be said to have libell'd, as he against whom he writes: there ye shall find another man than here is made shew of, there he bites as fast as this whines. "Vinegar in the ink" is there "the antidote of vipers." Laughing in a religious controversy is there "a thrifty physic to expel his melancholy." In the mean time the testimony of Sir Francis Bacon was not misalleged, complaining that libels on the Bishops part were uttered openly; and if he hoped the Prelates had no intelligence with the libellers, he delivers it but as his favourable opinion. But had he contradicted himself, how could I assail him here, more than a little before, where I know not how, by entangling himself, he leaves an aspersion upon Job, which by any else I never heard laid to his charge? For having affirmed that "there is no greater confusion than the confounding of jest and earnest," presently he brings the example of Job, "glancing at conceits of mirth, when he sat among the people with the gravity of a judge upon him." If jest and earnest be such a confusion, then were the people much wiser than Job, for "he smil'd, and they believed him not." To defend libels, which is that whereof I am next accus'd, was far from my purpose. I had not so little share in good name, as to give another that advantage against myself. The sum of what I said was, that a more free permission of writing at some times might be profitable, in such a question especially wherein the magistrates are not fully resolv'd; and both sides have equal liberty to write, as now they have. Not as when the Prelates bore sway, in whose time the books of some men were confuted, when they who should have answer'd were in close prison, deny'd the use of pen or paper. And the divine right of Episcopacy was then valiantly asserted, when he who would have been respondent must have bethought himself withal how he could refute the Clink or the Gatehouse. If now therefore they be pursu'd with bad words, who persecuted others with bad deeds, it is a way to lessen tumult rather than to encrease it; whenas anger thus freely vented, spends itself ere it break out into action, though Machiavel, whom he cites, or any Machiavilian Priest think the contrary.

S E C T. III.

Now, readers, I bring ye to his third section; wherein very cautiously and no more than needs: lest I should take him for some chaplain at hand, some squire of the body to his Prelate, one that serves not at the altar only, but at the court cup-board, he will bestow on us a pretty model of himself; and fobs me out half a dozen ptizical motto's, wherever he had them, hopping short in the measure of convulsion-fits; in which labour the agony of his wit having escap'd narrowly, instead of well-fiz'd periods, he greets us with a quantity of thumb-ring posies. "He has a fortune therefore good, because he is content with it." This is a piece of sapience not worth the brain of a fruit-trencher; as if content were the measure of what is good or bad in the gift of fortune. For by this rule a bad man may have a good fortune, because he may be oft-times content with it for many reasons which have no affinity with virtue, as love of ease, want of spirit to use more, and the like. "And therefore content," he says, "because it neither goes before, nor comes behind his merit." Belike then if his fortune should go before his merit, he would not be content, but resign, if we believe him, which I do the less, because he implies, that if it came behind his merit, he would be content as little. Whereas if a wise man's content should depend upon such a Therefore, because his fortune came not behind his merit, how many wise men could have content in this world? In his next pithy symbol I dare not board him, for he passes all the seven wise Masters of Greece, attributing to himself that which on my life Solomon durst not; "to have affections so equally temper'd, that they neither too hastily adhere to the truth before it be fully examin'd,

amin'd, nor too lazily afterward." Which unless he only were exempted out of the corrupt mass of Adam, born without sin original, and living without actual, is impossible. Had Solomon (for it behoves me to instance in the wisest, dealing with such a transcendent sage as this) had Solomon affections so equally temper'd, as "not adhering too lazily to the truth," when God warn'd him of his halting in idolatry? do we read that he repented hastily? did not his affections lead him hastily from an examin'd truth, how much more would they lead him slowly to it? Yet this man beyond a Stoic Apathy, sees truth as in a rapture, and cleaves to it; not as through the dim glass of his affections, which in this frail mansion of flesh, are ever unequally temper'd, pushing forward to error, and keeping back from truth oft-times the best of men. But how far this boaster is from knowing himself, let his Preface speak. Something I thought it was that made him so quick-sighted to gather such strange things out of the animadversions, whereof the least conception could not be drawn from thence, of Suburb-sinks, sometimes "out of wit and cloaths, sometimes in new Serge, drinking Sack, and swearing;" now I know it was this equal temper of his affections that gave him to see clearer than any fennel-rub'd serpent. Lastly, he has resolv'd "that neither person nor cause shall improper him." I may mistake his meaning, for the word ye hear is "improper." But whether if not a person, yet a good parsonage or impropriation bought out for him would not improper him, because there may be a quirk in the word, I leave it for a canonist to resolve.

S E C T. IV.

And thus ends this section, or rather dissection of himself; short ye will say both in breath and extent, as in our own praises it ought to be, unless wherein a good name hath been wrongfully attained. Right, but if ye look at what he ascribes to himself, "that temper of his affections" which cannot any where be but in paradise, all the judicious Panegyrics in any language extant are not half so prolix. And that well appears in his next removal. For what with putting his fancy to the tiptoe in this description of himself, and what with adventuring presently to stand upon his own legs without the crutches of his margin, which is the sluice most commonly that feeds the drowth of his text, he comes so lazily on in a simily, with his "arm full of weeds," and demeans himself in the dull expression so like a dough-kneaded thing, that he has not spirit enough left him so far to look to his Syntaxis, as to avoid nonsense. For it must be understood there that the Stranger, and not he who brings the bundle, would be deceiv'd in censuring the field, which this hipshot Grammarian cannot set into right frame of construction, neither here in the similitude, nor in the following Reddition thereof; which being to this purpose, that "the faults of the best pickt out, and presented in gross, seem monstrous, this," saith he, "you have done, in pinning on his sleeve the faults of others;" as if to pick out his own faults, and to pin the faults of others upon him, were to do the same thing. To answer therefore how I have cull'd out the evil actions of the remonstrant from his virtues, I am acquitted by the dexterity and conveyance of his nonsense, losing that for which he brought his parable. But what of other men's faults I have pinn'd upon his sleeve, let him shew. For whether he were the man who term'd the martyrs Foxian confessors, it matters not; he that shall step up before others to defend a Church government, which wants almost no circumstance, but only a name to be a plain popedom, a government which changes the fatherly and ever-teaching discipline of Christ into that lordly and un-instructing jurisdiction which properly makes the pope antichrist, makes himself an accessory to all the evil committed by those, who are arm'd to do mischief by that undue government; which they by their wicked deeds, do with a kind of passive and unwitting obedience to God destroy. But he by plausible words and traditions against the Scripture obstinately seeks to maintain. They by their own wickedness ruining their own unjust authority, make room for good to succeed. But he by a shew of good upholding the evil which in them undoes itself, hinders the good which they by accident let in.

Their

Their manifest crimes serve to bring forth an ensuing good, and hasten a remedy against themselves; and his seeming good tends to reinforce their self-punishing crimes and his own, by doing his best to delay all redress. Shall not all the mischief which other men do be laid to his charge, if they do it by that unchurch-like power which he defends? Christ saith, "he that is not with me, is against me, and he that gathers not with me, scatters." In what degree of enmity to Christ shall we place that man then, who so is with him, as that it makes more against him, and so gathers with him, that it scatters more from him? Shall it avail that man to say he honours the martyrs memory, and treads in their steps? No; the Pharisees confess'd as much of the holy prophets. Let him, and such as he, when they are in their best actions, even at their prayers, look to hear that which the Pharisees heard from John the Baptist, when they least expected, when they rather look'd for praise from him; "Generation of vipers, who hath warn'd ye to flee from the wrath to come?" Now that ye have started back from the purity of Scripture, which is the only rule of reformation, to the old vomit of your traditions; now that ye have either troubled or leaven'd the people of God, and the doctrine of the gospel with scandalous ceremonies and mass-borrow'd Liturgies, do ye turn the use of that truth which ye profess, to countenance that falsehood which ye gain by? We also reverence the martyrs, but rely only upon the Scriptures. And why we ought not to rely upon the martyrs, I shall be content with such reasons as my confuter himself affords me; who is, I must needs say for him, in that point as officious an adversary as I would wish to any man. For, "first," saith he, "there may be a martyr in a wrong cause, and as courageous in suffering as the best; sometimes in a good cause with a forward ambition displeasing to God. Other whiles they that story of them out of blind zeal or malice, may write many things of them untruly." If this be so, as ye hear his own confession, with what safety can the remonstrant rely upon the martyrs as "Patrons of his cause," whenas any of those who are alledged for the approvers of our Liturgy or Prelaty, might have been, though not in a wrong cause, martyrs? yet whether not vainly ambitious of that honour, or whether not misreported or misunderstood in those their opinions, God only knows. The testimony of what we believe in religion must be such as the conscience may rest on to be infallible and incorruptible, which is only the word of God.

S E C T. V.

His fifth section finds itself aggrieved that the remonstrant should be tax'd with the illegal proceeding of the high commission, and oath ex officio: And first, "whether they were illegal or no, 'tis more than he knows." See this malevolent fox! that tyranny which the whole kingdom cry'd out against as stung with adders and scorpions, that tyranny which the Parliament in compassion of the Church and Commonwealth hath dissolv'd and fetch'd up by the roots, for which it hath receiv'd the public thanks and blessings of thousands; this obscure thorn-eater of malice and detraction, as well as of Quodlibets and Sophisms, knows not whether it were illegal or not. Evil, evil, would be your reward, ye worthies of the Parliament, if this Sophister and his accomplices had the censuring or the sounding forth of your labours. And that the Remonstrant cannot wash his hands of all the cruelties exercis'd by the Prelates, is past doubting. They scourged the confessors of the gospel, and he held the scourgers garments. They executed their rage; and he, if he did nothing else, defended the government with the oath that did it, and the ceremonies which were the cause of it: does he think to be counted guiltless?

S E C T. VI.

In the following section I must foretel ye, readers, the doings will be rough and dangerous, the baiting of a Satyr. And if the work seem more trivial or boisterous than for this discourse, let the remonstrant thank the folly of this confuter, who could not let

a private word pass, but he must make all this blaze of it. I had said, that because the remonstrant was so much offended with those who were tart against the Prelates, sure he lov'd toothless satyrs, which I took were as improper as a toothed sleekstone. This champion from behind the arras cries out, that those toothless satyrs were of the remonstrant's making; and arms himself here tooth and nail, and horn to boot, to supply the want of teeth, or rather of gums in the satyrs. And for an onset tells me, that the simily of a sleekstone "shews I can be as bold with a Prelate as familiar with a laundress." But does it not argue rather the lascivious promptness of his own fancy, who from the harmless mention of a sleekstone could neigh out the remembrance of his old conversation among the Viraginian trollops? For me, if he move me, I shall claim his own oath, the oath ex officio against any priest or prelate in the kingdom, to have ever as much hated such pranks as the best and chastest of them all. That exception which I made against toothless satyrs, the confuter hopes I had from the Satyrist, but is far deceiv'd: neither had I ever read the hobbling Distich which he means. For this good hap I had from a careful education, to be inur'd and season'd betimes with the best and elegantest authors of the learned tongues, and thereto brought an ear that could measure a just cadence, and scan without articulating; rather nice and humorous in what was tolerable, than patient to read every drawling versifier. Whence lighting upon this title of "toothless Satyrs," I will not conceal ye what I thought, readers, that sure this must be some sucking satyr, who might have done better to have us'd his coral, and made an end of breeding, ere he took upon him to wield a satyr's whip. But when I heard him talk of "scowering the rusty swords of elvish knights," do not blame me, if I chang'd my thought, and concluded him some desperate cutler. But why "his scornful muse could never abide with tragic shoes her ancles for to hide," the pace of the verse told me that her maukin knuckles were never shapen to that royal buskin. And turning by chance to the sixth satyr of his second book, I was confirm'd; where having begun loftily "in heaven's universal alphabet," he falls down to that wretched poorness and frigidity, as to talk of "Bridge-street in Heaven, and the Ostler of Heaven," and there wanting other matter to catch him a heat, (for certain he was in the frozen Zone miserably benumb'd) with thoughts lower than any beadle betakes him to whip the sign-posts of Cambridge ale-houses, the ordinary subject of freshmens tales, and in a strain as pitiful. Which for him who would be counted the first English satyr, to abase himself to, who might have learnt better among the Latin and Italian satyrists, and in our own tongue from the "Vision and Creed of Pierce Plowman," besides others before him, manifested a presumptuous undertaking with weak and unexamin'd shoulders. For a satyr as it was born out of a Tragedy, so ought to resemble his parentage, to strike high, and adventure dangerously at the most eminent vices among the greatest persons, and not to creep into every blind taphouse that fears a constable more than a satyr. But that such a poem should be toothless, I still affirm it to be a bull, taking away the essence of that which it calls itself. For if it bite neither the persons nor the vices, how is it a satyr? and if it bite either, how is it toothless? so that toothless satyrs are as much as if he had said toothless teeth. What we should do therefore with this learned comment upon Teeth and Horns, which hath brought this confutant into his pedantic kingdom of Cornucopia, to reward him for glossing upon Horns even to the Hebrew-root, I know not; unless we should commend him to be lecturer in East-cheap upon St. Luke's day, when they send their tribute to that famous Haven by Deptford. But we are not like to 'scape him so. For now the worm of Criticism works in him, he will tell us the derivation of "German rutters, of meat, and of ink," which doubtless, rightly apply'd with some gall in it, may prove good to heal this tetter of Pedagoguism that bespreads him, with such a Tenasmus of originating, that if he be an Arminian, and deny original sin, all the Etymologies of his book shall witness that his brain is not meanly tainted with that infection.

S E C T. VII.

His seventh section labours to cavil out the flaws which were found in the remonstrant's logic; who having laid down for a general proposition, that "civil polity is variable and arbitrary," from whence was inferr'd logically upon him that he had concluded the polity of England to be arbitrary, for general includes particular; here his defendant is not ashamed to confess that the remonstrant's proposition was sophistical by a Fallacy called, *ad plures interrogationes*: which sounds to me somewhat strange that a remonstrant of that pretended sincerity should bring deceitful and double-dealing propositions to the parliament. The truth is, he had let slip a shrewd passage ere he was aware, not thinking the conclusion would turn upon him with such a terrible edge, and not knowing how to wind out of the briars, he or his substitute seems more willing to lay the integrity of his logic to pawn, and grant a fallacy in his own major where none is, than to be forced to uphold the inference. For that distinction of possible and lawful is ridiculous to be sought for in that proposition; no man doubting that it is possible to change the form of civil polity; and that it is held lawful by that Major, the word "arbitrary" implies. Nor will this help him, to deny that it is arbitrary "at any time, or by any undertakers," (which are two limitations invented by him since) for when it stands as he will have it now by his second edition, "civil polity is variable, but not at any time, or by any undertakers," it will result upon him, belike then at some time, and by some undertakers it may. And so he goes on mincing the matter, till he meets with something in Sir Francis Bacon, then he takes heart again, and holds his Major at large. But by and by, as soon as the shadow of Sir Francis hath left him, he falls off again warping and warping, till he come to contradict himself in diameter; and denies flatly that it is "either variable or arbitrary, being once settled." Which third shift is no less a piece of laughter: For before the Polity was settled, how could it be variable, whenas it was no polity at all, but either an anarchy or a tyranny? That limitation therefore, of after settling, is a mere tautology. So that in fine his former assertion is now recanted, and "civil polity is neither variable nor arbitrary."

S E C T. VIII.

Whatever else may persuade me that this confutation was not made without some assistance or advice of the remonstrant, yet in this eighth section that his hand was not greatly intermix'd, I can easily believe. For it begins with this surmise, that "not having to accuse the remonstrant to the king, I do it to the parliament" which conceit of the man cleanly shoves the king out of the parliament, and makes two bodies of one. Whereas the remonstrant in the epistle to his last "short answer, gives his supposal that they cannot be sever'd in the rights of their several concernments." Mark, readers, if they cannot be severed in what is several (which casts a bull's eye to go yoke with the toothless satyrs, how should they be sever'd in their common concernments, the welfare of the land, by due accusation of such as are the common grievances, among which I took the remonstrant to be one? And therefore if I accused him to the parliament, it was the same as to accuse him to the king. Next he casts it into the dish of I know not whom, "that they flatter some of the house, and libel others whose consciences made them vote contrary to some proceedings." Those some proceedings can be understood of nothing else but the deputy's execution. And can this private concoctor of male-content, at the very instant when he pretends to extol the parliament, afford thus to blur over, rather than to mention that public triumph of their justice and constancy, so high, so glorious, so reviving to the fainted commonwealth, with such a suspicious and murmuring expression as to call it some Proceedings? and yet immediately he falls to glozing, as if he were the only man that rejoic'd at these times. But I shall discover to ye, readers, that this his praising of them is as full of nonsense and scholastic foppery,
as

as his meaning he himself discovers to be full of close malignity. His first encomium is, "that the sun looks not upon a braver, nobler convocation than is that of king, peers, and commons." One thing I beg of ye readers, as ye bear any zeal to learning, to elegance, and that which is called decorum in the writing of praise, especially on such a noble argument, ye would not be offended, though I rate this cloister'd lubber according to his deserts. Where didst thou learn to be so aguish, so pusillanimous, thou lozel batchelor of art, as against all custom and use of speech to term the high and sovereign court of parliament, a convocation? Was this the flower of all the Synonima's and voluminous Papers, whose best Folio's are predestin'd to no better end than to make winding sheets in Lent for pilchers? Could'st thou presume thus with one word's speaking to clap as it were under hatches the king with all his peers and gentry into square caps, and monkish hoods? How well dost thou now appear to be a chip of the old block, that could find "Bridge-street and Alehouses in Heaven?" why didst thou not, to be his perfect imitator, liken the king to the vice-chancellor, and the lords to the doctors? Neither is this an indignity only but a reproach, to call that inviolable residence of justice and liberty, by such an odious name as now a "Convocation" is become, which would be nothing injured, though it were stiled the house of bondage, whereout so many cruel tasks, so many unjust burthens have been laden upon the bruised consciences of so many christians throughout the land. But which of those worthy deeds, whereof we and our posterity must confess this parliament to have done so many and so noble, which of those memorable acts comes first into his praises? none of all, not one. What will he then praise them for? not for any thing doing, but for deferring to do, for deferring to chastise his lewd and insolent Compriests: Not that they have deferr'd all, but that he hopes they will remit what is yet behind. For the rest of his oratory that follows, so just is it in the language of stall-epistle nonsense, that if he who made it can understand it, I deny not but that he may deserve for his pains a cast doublet. When a man would look he should vent something of his own, as ever in a set speech the manner is with him that knows any thing, he, lest we should not take notice enough of his barren stupidity, declares it by alphabet, and refers us to odd remnants in his topics. Nor yet content with the wonted room of his margent, but he must cut out large docks and creeks into his text to unlade the foolish frigate of his unseasonable authorities, not therewith to praise the parliament, but to tell them what he would have them do. What else there is, he jumbles together in such a lost construction, as no man either letter'd or unletter'd, will be able to piece up. I shall spare to transcribe him, but if I do him wrong, let me be so dealt with.

Now although it be a digression from the ensuing matter, yet because it shall not be said I am apter to blame others than to make trial myself, and that I may after this harsh discord touch upon a smoother string a-while to entertain myself and him that list, with some more pleasing fit, and not the least to testify the gratitude which I owe to those public benefactors of their country, for the share I enjoy in the common peace and good by their incessant labours; I shall be so troublesome to this declaimer for once, as to shew him what he might have better said in their praise: wherein I must mention only some few things of many, for more than that to a digression may not be granted. Although certainly their actions are worthy not thus to be spoken of by the way, yet if hereafter it befall me to attempt something more answerable to their great merits, I perceive how hopeless it will be to reach the height of their praises at the accomplishment of that expectation that waits upon their noble deeds, the unfinished whereof already surpasses what others before them have left enacted with their utmost performance thro' many ages. And to the end we may be confident that what they do, proceeds neither from uncertain opinion, nor sudden counsels, but from mature wisdom, deliberate virtue, and dear affection to the public good; I shall begin at that which made them likeliest in the eyes of good men to effect those things for the recovery of decayed religion

gion and the commonwealth, which they who were best minded had long wished for, but few, as the times then were desperate, had the courage to hope for. First, therefore, the most of them being either of ancient and high nobility, or at least of known and well-reputed ancestry, which is a great advantage towards virtue one way, but in respect of wealth, ease and flattery, which accompanies a nice and tender education, is as much a hindrance another way; the good which lay before them they took, in imitating the worthiest of their progenitors; and the evil which assaulted their younger years by the temptation of riches, high birth, and that usual bringing up, perhaps too favourable and too remiss, through the strength of an inbred goodness, and with the help of divine grace, that had mark'd them out for no mean purposes, they nobly overcame. Yet had they a greater danger to cope with; for being trained up in the knowledge of learning, and sent to those places which were intended to be the seed-plots of piety and the liberal arts, but were become the nurseries of superstition and empty speculation, as they were prosperous against those vices which grow upon youth out of idleness and superfluity, so were they happy in working off the harms of their abused studies and labours; correcting by the clearness of their own judgment the errors of their mis-instruction, and were as David was, wiser than their teachers. And although their lot fell into such times, and to be bred in such places, where if they chanc'd to be taught any thing good, or of their own accord had learnt it, they might see that presently untaught them by the custom and ill example of their elders; so far in all probability was their youth from being misled by the single power of example, as their riper years were known to be unmov'd with the baits of preferment, and undaunted for any discouragement and terror which appeared often to those that lov'd religion and their native liberty: which two things God hath inseparably knit together, and hath disclosed to us, that they who seek to corrupt our religion, are the same that would enthrall our civil liberty. Thus in the midst of all disadvantages and disrespects (some also at last not without imprisonment and open disgraces in the cause of their country) having given proof of themselves to be better made and fram'd by nature to the love and practice of virtue, than others under the holiest precepts and best examples have been headstrong and prone to vice; and having in all the trials of a firm ingrafted honesty not oftner buckled in the conflict than given every opposition the foil; this moreover was added by favour from Heaven, as an ornament and happiness to their virtue, that it should be neither obscure in the opinion of men, nor eclipsed for want of matter equal to illustrate itself; God and man consenting in joint approbation to chuse them out as worthiest above others to be both the great reformers of the church, and the restorers of the commonwealth. Nor did they deceive that expectation which with the eyes and desires of their country was fixt upon them; for no sooner did the force of so much united excellence meet in one globe of brightness and efficacy, but encountering the dazled resistance of tyranny, they gave not over, though their enemies were strong and suttel, till they had laid her groveling upon the fatal block: with one stroke winning again our lost liberties and charters, which our forefathers after so many battles could scarce maintain. And meeting next, as I may so resemble, with the second life of tyranny (for she was grown an ambiguous monster, and to be slain in two shapes) guarded with superstition which hath no small power to captivate the minds of men otherwise most wise, they neither were taken with her mitred hypocrisy, nor terrify'd with the push of her bestial horns, but breaking them immediately forc'd her to unbend the pontifical brow, and recoil: Which repulse only given to the prelates (that we may imagine how happy their removal would be) was the producement of such glorious effects and consequences in the church, that if I should compare them with those exploits of highest fame in poems and Panegyrics of old; I am certain it would but diminish and impair their worth, who are now my argument: For those ancient worthies delivered men from such tyrants as were content to inforce only an outward obedience, letting the mind be as free as it could; but these have freed us from a doctrine

trine of tyranny that offered violence and corruption even to the inward persuasion. They set at liberty nations and cities of men good and bad mixed together; but these opening the prisons and dungeons, call'd out of darkness and bonds the elect martyrs and witnesses of their redeemer. They restor'd the body to ease and wealth; but these the oppressed conscience to that freedom which is the chief prerogative of the gospel; taking off those cruel burthens imposed not by necessity, as other tyrants are wont for the safe-guard of their lives, but laid upon our necks by the strange wilfulness and wantonness of a needless and jolly persecutor call'd indifference. Lastly, some of those ancient deliverers have had immortal praises for preserving their citizens from a famine of corn. But these by this only repulse of an unholy hierarchy, almost in a moment replenish'd with saving knowledge their country nigh famish'd for want of that which should feed their souls. All this being done while two armies in the field stood gazing on, the one in reverence of such nobleness quietly gave back and dislodg'd; the other, spight of the unruliness, and doubted fidelity in some regiments, was either persuaded or compell'd to disband and retire home. With such a majesty had their wisdom begirt itself, that whereas others had levied war to subdue a nation that sought for peace, they sitting here in peace, could so many miles extend the force of their single words as to overawe the dissolute stoutness of an armed power secretly stirr'd up and almost hir'd against them. And having by a solemn protestation vow'd themselves and the kingdom anew to God and his service, and by a prudent foresight above what their fathers thought on, prevented the dissolution and frustrating of their designs by an untimely breaking up; notwithstanding all the treasonous plots against them, all the rumours either of rebellion or invasion, they have not been yet brought to change their constant resolution, ever to think fearlessly of their own safeties, and hopefully of the commonwealth: which hath gain'd them such an admiration from all good men, that now they hear it as their ordinary surname, to be saluted the fathers of their country, and sit as Gods among daily petitions and public thanks flowing in upon them. Which doth so little yet exalt them in their own thoughts, that with all gentle affability, and courteous acceptance they both receive and return that tribute of thanks which is tender'd them; testifying their zeal and desire to spend themselves as it were piece-meal upon the grievances and wrongs of their distressed nation: insomuch that the meanest artisans and labourers, at other times also women, and often the younger sort of servants assembling with their complaints, and that sometimes in a less humble guise than for petitioners, have gone with confidence, that neither their meanness would be rejected, nor their simplicity contemn'd; nor yet their urgency distast'd either by the dignity, wisdom, or moderation of that supreme senate; nor did they depart unsatisfied. And indeed, if we consider the general concurrence of suppliants, the free and ready admittance, the willing and speedy redress in what is possible, it will not seem much otherwise, than as if some divine commission from Heaven were descended to take into hearing and commiseration the long remediless afflictions of this kingdom; were it not that none more than themselves labour to remove and divert such thoughts, lest men should place too much confidence in their persons, still referring us and our prayers to him that can grant all, and appointing the monthly return of public fasts and supplications. Therefore the more they seek to humble themselves, the more does God by manifest signs and testimonies, visibly honour their proceedings; and sets them as the mediators of this his covenant, which he offers us to renew. Wicked men daily conspire their hurt, and it comes to nothing; rebellion rages in our Irish province, but with miraculous and lossless victories of few against many, is daily discomfited and broken; if we neglect not this early pledge of God's inclining towards us, by the slackness of our needful aids. And whereas at other times we count it ample honour when God vouchsafes to make man the instrument and subordinate worker of his gracious will, such acceptation have their prayers found with him, that to them he hath been pleas'd to make himself the agent, and immediate performer of their de-

fires; dissolving their difficulties when they are thought inexplicable, cutting out ways for them where no passage could be seen; as who is there so regardless of divine providence, that from late occurrences will not confess? If therefore it be so high a grace when men are preferr'd to be but the inferior officers of good things from God, what is it when God himself condescends, and works with his own hands to fulfil the requests of men? Which I leave with them as the greatest praise that can belong to human nature: not that we should think they are at the end of their glorious progress, but that they will go on to follow his Almighty leading, who seems to have thus covenanted with them; that if the will and the endeavour shall be theirs, the performance and the perfecting shall be his. Whence only it is that I have not fear'd, though many wise men have miscarried in praising great designs before the utmost event, because I see who is their assistant, who is their confederate, who hath engaged his omnipotent arm to support and crown with success their faith, their fortitude, their just and magnanimous actions, till he have brought to pass all that expected good which his servants trust is in his thoughts to bring upon this land in the full and perfect reformation of his church.

Thus far I have digress'd, readers, from my former subject; but into such a path, as I doubt not ye will agree with me, to be much fairer, and more delightful than the road-way I was in. And how to break off suddenly into those jarring notes which this confuter hath set me, I must be wary, unless I can provide against offending the ear, as some musicians are wont skilfully to fall out of one key into another, without breach of harmony. By good luck therefore his ninth section is spent in mournful elegy, certain passionate soliloquies; and two whole pages of interrogatories that praise the remonstrant even to the sonneting of "his fresh cheeks, quick eyes, round tongue, agil hand and nimble invention."

In his tenth section he will needs erect figures, and tell fortunes; "I am no bishop," he says, "I was never born to it." Let me tell therefore this wizard, since he calculates so right, that he may know there be in the world, and I among those, who nothing admire his idol a bishopric; and hold that it wants so much to be a blessing, as that I rather deem it the merest, the falsest, the most unfortunate gift of fortune. And were the punishment and misery of being a prelate bishop, terminated only in the person, and did not extend to the affliction of the whole diocese, if I would wish any thing in the bitterness of soul to mine enemy, I would wish him the biggest and fattest bishopric. But he proceeds; and the familiar belike informs him, that "a rich widow, or a lecture, or both, would content me:" whereby I perceive him to be more ignorant in his art of divining than any gipsy. For this I cannot omit without ingratitude to that Providence above, who hath ever bred me up in plenty, although my life hath not been unexpensive in learning, and voyaging about; so long as it shall please him to lend me what he hath hitherto thought good, which is enough to serve me in all honest and liberal occasions, and something over besides, I were unthankful to that highest bounty, if I should make myself so poor, as to solicit needily any such kind of rich hopes as this Fortune-teller dreams of. And that he may further learn how his astrology is wide all the houses of Heaven in spelling marriages, I care not if I tell him thus much profestly, though it be the losing of my rich hopes, as he calls them, that I think with them who both in prudence and elegance of spirit, would chuse a virgin of mean fortunes honestly bred, before the wealthiest widow. The fiend therefore that told our Chaldean the contrary, was a lying fiend. His next venom he utters against a prayer which he found in the animadversions, angry it seems to find any prayers but in the service-book; he dislikes it, and I therefore like it the better. "It was theatrical," he says; and yet it consisted most of scripture language; it had no Rubric to be sung in an antic cope upon the stage of a high altar. "It was big-mouth'd" he says; no marvel, if it were fram'd as the voice of three kingdoms: neither was it a prayer so much as a hymn in prose, frequent both in the prophets, and in human authors; therefore the stile was
greater

greater than for an ordinary prayer. "It was an astonishing prayer." I thank him for that confession, so it was intended to astound and to astonish the guilty prelates; and this confuter confesses that with him it wrought that effect. But in that which follows, he does not play the soothsayer, but the diabolic slanderer of prayers. "It was made," he says, "not so much to please God, or to benefit the Weal-public" (how dares the viper judge that?) "but to intimate," saith he, "your good abilities to her that is your rich hopes," your Maronilla." How hard is it when a man meets with a fool to keep his tongue from folly? That were miserable indeed to be a courtier of Maronilla, and withal of such a hapless invention, as that no way should be left me to present my meaning, but to make myself a canting probationer of orisons. The Remonstrant, when he was as young as I, could

Toothless "Teach each hollow grove to sound his love,
Satyrs, Wearying echo with one changeless word."

And so he well might, and all his auditory besides with his "teach each."

Toothless "Whether so me list my lovely thoughts to sing,
Satyrs, Come dance ye nimble dryads by my side,
 Whiles I report my fortunes or my loves."

Delicious! he had that whole Bevie at command whether in morrice or at may-pole; whilst I by this figure-caster must be imagin'd in such distress as to sue to Maronilla, and yet left so impoverish'd of what to say, as to turn my liturgy into my lady's Psalter. Believe it Graduate, I am not altogether so rustic, and nothing so irreligious, but as far distant from a lecturer, as the merest laic, for any consecrating hand of a prelate that shall ever touch me. Yet I shall not decline the more for that, to speak my opinion in the controversy next mov'd, "Whether the people may be allowed for competent judges of a minister's ability." For how else can be fulfill'd that which God hath promised, to pour out such abundance of knowledge upon all sorts of men in the times of the gospel? how should the people examine the doctrine which is taught them, as Christ and his apostles continually bid them do? how should they "discern and beware of false prophets, and try every spirit," if they must be thought unfit to judge of the minister's abilities? The apostles ever labour'd to persuade the christian flock that they "were call'd in Christ to all perfectness of spiritual knowledge, and full assurance of understanding in the mystery of God." But the non-resident and plurality-gaping Prelates, the gulphs and whirlpools of benefices, but the dry pits of all sound doctrine, that they may the better preach what they list to their sheep, are still possessing them that they are sheep indeed, without judgment, without understanding, "the very beasts of mount Sinai," as this confuter calls them; which words of theirs may serve to condemn them out of their own mouths, and to shew the gross contrarieties that are in their opinions: For while none think the people so void of knowledge as the prelates think them, none are so backward and malignant as they to bestow knowledge upon them; both by suppressing the frequency of sermons, and the printed explanations of the English bible. No marvel if the people turn beasts, when their teachers themselves, as Isaiah calls them, "are dumb and greedy dogs, that can never have enough, ignorant, blind, and cannot understand; who while they all look their own way, every one for his gain from his quarter," how many parts of the land are fed with windy ceremonies instead of sincere milk; and while one prelate enjoys the nourishment and right of twenty ministers, how many waste places are left as dark as "Galilee of the Gentiles, sitting in the region and shadow of death," without preaching minister, without light. So little care they of beasts to make them men, that by their forcereous doctrine of formalities, they take the
way

way to transform them out of Christian men into Judaizing beasts. Had they but taught the land, or suffered it to be taught, as Christ would it should have been in all plenteous dispensation of the word, then the poor mechanic might have so accustom'd his ear to good teaching, as to have discern'd between faithful teachers and false. But now with a most inhuman cruelty they who have put out the peoples eyes, reproach them of their blindness; just as the Pharisees their true fathers were wont, who could not indure that the people should be thought competent judges of Christ's doctrine, although we know they judg'd far better than those great rabbies: yet "this People," said they, "that knows not the law is accurst." We need not the authority of Pliny brought to tell us, the people cannot judge of a minister: yet that hurts not. For as none can judge of a painter, or statuary, but he who is an artist, that is, either in the Practic or Theory, which is often separated from the Practic, and judges learnedly without it; so none can judge of a christian teacher, but he who hath either the practice, or the knowledge of christian religion, though not so artfully digested in him. And who almost of the meanest christians hath not heard the scriptures often read from his Childhood, besides so many sermons and lectures more in number than any student hath heard in philosophy, whereby he may easily attain to know when he is wisely taught, and when weakly? whereof three ways I remember are set down in scripture: The one is to read often that best of books written to this purpose, that not the wise only, but the simple and ignorant may learn by them; the other way to know of a minister, is by the life he leads, whereof the meanest understanding may be apprehensive. The last way to judge aright in this point, is, when he who judges, lives a christian life himself. Which of these three will the confuter affirm to exceed the capacity of a plain artizan? And what reason then is there left wherefore he should be denied his voice in the election of his minister, as not thought a competent discerner? It is but arrogance therefore, and the pride of a metaphysical fume, to think that "the mutinous rabble" (for so he calls the christian congregation) "would be so mistaken in a clerk of the university" that were to be their minister. I doubt me those clerks that think so, are more mistaken in themselves; and what with truanting and debauchery, what with false grounds and the weakness of natural faculties in many of them (it being a maxim in some men to send the simplest of their sons thither) perhaps there would be found among them as many unsolid and corrupted judgments both in doctrine and life, as in any other two corporations of like bigness. This is undoubted, that if any carpenter, smith, or weaver, were such a bungler in his trade, as the greater number of them are in their profession, he would starve for any custom. And should he exercise his manufacture as little as they do their talents, he would forget his art: and should he mistake his tools as they do theirs, he would marr all the work he took in hand. How few among them that know to write, or speak in a pure stile; much less to distinguish the Ideas, and various kinds of stile; in Latin barbarous, and oft not without Solecisms, declaiming in rugged and miscellaneous gear blown together by the four winds, and in their choice preferring the gay rankness of Apuleius, Arnobius, or any modern Fustianist, before the native Latinisms of Cicero. In the Greek tongue most of them unletter'd, or "unenter'd to any sound proficiency in those Attic masters of moral wisdom and eloquence. In the Hebrew text, which is so necessary to be understood, except it be some few of them, their lips are utterly uncircumcis'd. No less are they out of the way in philosophy, pestering their heads with the sapless dotages of old Paris and Salamanca. And that which is the main point, in their sermons affecting the comments and postils of friars and jesuits, but scorning and slighting the reformed writers: Insomuch that the better sort among them will confess it a rare matter to hear a true edifying sermon in either of their great churches; and that such as are most humm'd and applauded there, would scarce be suffered the second hearing in a grave congregation of pious christians. Is there cause why these men should overwean, and be so queasy of the rude multitude, lest their deep worth should be undervalued for want of fit umpires? No, my matriculated confutant, there will

will not want in any congregation of this island, that hath not been altogether famished, or wholly perverted with prelatish leaven; there will not want divers plain and solid men, that have learnt by the experience of a good conscience, what it is to be well taught, who will soon look through and through both the lofty nakedness of your latinizing barbarian, and the finical goosery of your neat sermon-actor. And so I leave you and your fellow "Stars;" as you term them, "of either Horizon," meaning I suppose either Hemisphere, unless you will be ridiculous in your astronomy: for the rational horizon in heaven is but one, and the sensible horizons in earth are innumerable; so that your allusion was as erroneous as your stars. But that you did well to prognosticate them all at lowest in the horizon; that is, either seeming bigger than they are through the mist and vapour which they raise, or else sinking and wasted to the snuff in their western socket.

S E C T. XI.

His eleventh section intends I know not what, unless to clog us with the residue of his phlegmatic sloth, discussing with a heavy pulse the "expedience of set forms:" which no question but to some, and for some time may be permitted, and perhaps there may be usefully set forth by the church a common Directory of public prayer, especially in the administration of the sacraments. But that it should therefore be enforced where both minister and people profess to have no need, but to be scandalized by it, that, I hope, every sensible christian will deny: and the reasons of such denial the confuter himself, as his bounty still is to his adversary, will give us out of his affirmation. First, saith he, "God in his providence hath chosen some to teach others, and pray for others, as ministers and pastors." Whence I gather, that however the faculty of others may be, yet that they whom God hath set apart to his ministry, are by him endued with an ability of prayer; because their office is to pray for others, and not to be the lip-working deacons of other men's appointed words. Nor is it easily credible, that he who can preach well, should be unable to pray well; whenas it is indeed the same ability to speak affirmatively, or doctrinally, and only by changing the mood, to speak prayingly. In vain therefore do they pretend to want utterance in prayer, who can find utterance to preach. And if prayer be the gift of the spirit, why do they admit those to the ministry, who want a main gift of their function, and prescribe gifted men to use that which is the remedy of another man's want; setting them their tasks to read, whom the spirit of God stands ready to assist in his ordinance with the gift of free conceptions? What if it be granted to the infirmity of some ministers (though such seem rather to be half ministers) to help themselves with a set form, shall it therefore be urged upon the plenteous graces of others? And let it be granted to some people while they are babes, in christian gifts, were it not better to take it away soon after, as we do loitering books, and interlineary translations from children; to stir up and exercise that portion of the spirit which is in them, and not impose it upon congregations who not only deny to need it, but as a thing troublesome and offensive, refuse it? Another reason which he brings for liturgy, is "the preserving of Order, Unity, and Piety;" and the same shall be my reason against liturgy. For I, readers, shall always be of this opinion, that obedience to the spirit of God, rather than to the fair seeming pretences of men, is the best and most dutiful order that a christian can observe. If the spirit of God manifest the gift of prayer in his minister, what more seemly order in the congregation, than to go along with that man in our devoutest affections? For him to abridge himself by reading, and to forestal himself in those petitions, which he must either omit, or vainly repeat, when he comes into the pulpit under a shew of order, is the greatest disorder. Nor is unity less broken, especially by our liturgy, though this author would almost bring the communion of saints to a communion of liturgical words. For what other reformed church holds communion with us by our liturgy, and does not rather dislike it? and among ourselves, who knows it not to have been a perpetual cause of disunion?

Lastly,

Lastly, it hinders piety rather than sets it forward, being more apt to weaken the spiritual faculties, if the people be not weaned from it in due time; as the daily pouring in of hot waters quenches the natural heat. For not only the body and the mind, but also the improvement of God's spirit is quickned by using. Whereas they who will ever adhere to liturgy, bring themselves in the end to such a pass by over-much leaning, as to lose even the legs of their devotion. These inconveniences and dangers follow the compelling of set forms: but that the toleration of the English liturgy now in use, is more dangerous than the compelling of any other which the reformed churches use, these reasons following may evince. To contend that it is fantastical, if not senseless in some places, were a copious argument, especially in the Responsories. For such alternations as are there used, must be by several persons; but the minister and the people cannot so sever their interests, as to sustain several persons; he being the only mouth of the whole body which he presents. And if the people pray, he being silent, or they ask one thing, and he another, it either changes the property, making the priest the people, and the people the priest by turns, or else makes two persons and two bodies representative where there should be but one. Which if it be nought else, must needs be a strange quaintness in ordinary prayer. The like, or worse, may be said of the Litany, wherein neither priest nor people speak any in-tire sense of themselves throughout the whole, I know not what to name it; only by the timely contribution of their parted stakes, closing up as it were the Schism of a sliced prayer, they pray not in vain, for by this means they keep life between them in a piece of gasping sense, and keep down the sauciness of a continual rebounding nonsense. And hence it is, that as it hath been far from the imitation of any warranted prayer, so we all know it hath been obvious to be the pattern of many a jig. And he who hath but read in good books of devotion and no more, cannot be so either of ear or judgment unpractised to distinguish what is grave, pathetical, devout and what not, but will presently perceive this liturgy all over in conception lean and dry, of affections empty and unmoving, of passion, or any height whereto the soul might soar upon the wings of zeal, destitute and barren; besides errors, Tautologies, impertinences, as those thanks in the woman's churching for her delivery from sun-burning and moon-blasting, as if she had been travailing not in her bed, but in the desarts of Arabia. So that while some men cease not to admire the incomparable frame of our liturgy, I cannot but admire as fast what they think is become of judgment and taste in other men, that they can hope to be heard without laughter. And if this were all, perhaps it were a compliable matter. But when we remember this our liturgy where we found it, whence we had it, and yet where we left it, still serving to all the abominations of the antichristian temple, it may be wondred how we can demur whether it should be done away or no, and not rather fear we have highly offended in using it so long. It hath indeed been pretended to be more ancient than the mass, but so little proved, that whereas other corrupt liturgies have had withal such a seeming antiquity, as that their publishers have ventured to ascribe them with their worst corruptions either to St. Peter, St. James, St. Mark, or at least to Chrysostome or Basil, ours hath been never able to find either age or author allowable, on whom to father those things therein which are least offensive, except the two creeds, for Te Deum has a smatch in it of Limbus Patrum: as if Christ had not "opened the kingdom of heaven" before he had "overcome the sharpness of death." So that having received it from the papal church as an original creature, for aught can be shewn to the contrary, formed and fashioned by work-masters ill to be trusted, we may be assured that if God loath the best of an idolater's prayer, much more the conceited fangle of his prayer. This confuter himself confesses that a community of the same set form in prayers, is that which "makes Church and Church truly one;" we then using a liturgy far more like to the mass-book than to any protestant set form, by his own words must have more communion with the Romish church, than with any of the reformed. How can we then not partake with them the curse and vengeance of their superstition, to whom we come so near in the same set form and dress of our devotion? Do
we

we think to sift the matter finer than we are sure God in his jealousy will, who detested both the gold and the spoil of idolatrous cities, and forbid the eating of things offered to idols? Are we stronger than he, to brook that which his heart cannot brook? It is not surely because we think that prayers are no where to be had but at Rome? that were a foul scorn and indignity cast upon all the reformed churches, and our own: if we imagine that all the godly ministers of England are not able to new-mould a better and more pious liturgy than this which was conceived and infanted by an idolatrous mother, how basely were that to esteem of God's spirit, and all the holy blessings and privileges of a true church above a false? Hark ye prelates, is this your glorious mother of England, who whenas Christ hath taught her to pray, thinks it not enough unless she add thereto the teaching of antichrist? how can we believe ye would refuse to take the stipend of Rome, when ye shame not to live upon the alms-basket of her prayers? Will ye persuade us that ye can curse Rome from your hearts, when none but Rome must teach ye to pray? Abraham disdained to take so much as a thread or a shoe-latchet from the king of Sodom, tho' no foe of his, but a wicked king; and shall we receive our prayers at the bounty of our more wicked enemies, whose gifts are no gifts, but the instruments of our bane? Alas, that the spirit of God should blow as an uncertain wind, should so mistake his inspiring, so misbestow his gifts promised only to the elect, that the idolatrous should find words acceptable to present God with, and abound to their neighbours, while the true professors of the gospel can find nothing of their own worth the constituting, wherewith to worship God in public! Consider if this be to magnify the church of England, and not rather to display her nakedness to all the world. Like therefore as the retaining of this Romish liturgy is a provocation to God, and a dishonour to our church, so is it by those ceremonies, those purifyings and offerings at the altar, a pollution and disturbance to the gospel itself; and a kind of driving us with the foolish Galatians to another gospel. For that which the apostles taught hath freed us in religion from the Ordinances of Men, and commands that "burdens be not laid" upon the redeemed of Christ; though the formalist will say, what no decency in God's worship? Certainly readers, the worship of God singly in itself, the very act of prayer and thanksgiving, with those free and unimposed expressions which from a sincere heart unbidden come into the outward gesture, is the greatest decency that can be imagined. Which to dress up and garnish with a devised bravery abolished in the law, and disclaimed by the gospel, adds nothing but a deformed ugliness; and hath ever afforded a colourable pretence to bring in all those traditions and carnalities that are so killing to the power and virtue of the gospel. What was that which made the Jews, figured under the names of Aholah and Aholibah, go a whoring after all the heathens inventions, but that they saw a religion gorgeously attired and desirable to the eye? What was all that the false doctors of the primitive church, and ever since have done, but "to make a fair shew in the flesh," as St. Paul's words are? If we have indeed given a bill of divorce to popery and superstition, why do we not say as to a divorced wife; Those things which are yours take them all with you, and they shall sweep after you? Why were not we thus wise at our parting from Rome? Ah! like a crafty adulteress she forgot not all her smooth looks and inticing words at her parting; yet keep these letters, these tokens, and these few ornaments; I am not all so greedy of what is mine, let them preserve with you the memory, of what I am? No, but of what I was, once fair and lovely in your eyes. Thus did those tender-hearted reformers dotingly suffer themselves to be overcome with harlots language. And she like a witch, but with a contrary policy, did not take something of theirs, that she might still have power to bewitch them, but for the same intent left something of her own behind her. And that her whorish cunning should prevail to work upon us her deceitful ends, though it be sad to speak, yet such is our blindness, that we deserve. For we are deep in dotage. We cry out Sacrilege and Misdevotion against those who in zeal have demolished the dens and cages of her unclean wallowings. We stand for a popish liturgy as for the ark of our covenant. And so little does it appear our prayers are from the heart, that multitudes of us declare, they know

not how to pray but by rote. Yet they can learnedly invent a prayer of their own to the parliament, that they may still ignorantly read the prayers of other men to God. They object, that if we must forsake all that is Rome's, we must bid adieu to our creed; and I had thought our creed had been of the apostles, for so it bears title. But if it be hers, let her take it. We can want no creed, so long as we want not the scriptures. We magnify those who in reforming our church have inconsiderately and blamefully permitted the old leaven to remain and sour our whole lump. But they were Martyrs; true, and he that looks well into the book of God's providence, if he read there that God for this their negligence and halting, brought all that following persecution upon this church, and on themselves, perhaps will be found at the last day not to have read amiss.

S E C T. XII.

But now, readers, we have the port within sight; his last section, which is no deep one, remains only to be forded, and then the wished shore. And here first it pleases him much, that he had descried me, as he conceives, to be unread in the councils. Concerning which matter it will not be unnecessary to shape him this answer; That some years I had spent in the stories of those Greek and Roman exploits, wherein I found many things both nobly done, and worthily spoken: when coming in the method of time to that age wherein the church had obtained a Christian emperor, I so prepared myself, as being now to read examples of wisdom and goodness among those who were foremost in the church, not elsewhere to be parallel'd: but to the amazement of what I expected, readers, I found it all quite contrary; excepting in some very few, nothing but ambition, corruption, contention, combustion: insomuch that I could not but love the historian Socrates, who in the proem to his fifth book professes, "he was fain to intermix affairs of state, for that it would be else an extreme annoyance to hear in a continued discourse the endless brabbles and counterplottings of the bishops." Finding therefore the most of their actions in single to be weak, and yet turbulent; full of strife, and yet flat of spirit; and the sum of their best councils there collected, to be most commonly in questions either trivial and vain, or else of short and easy decision; without that great bustle which they made; I concluded that if their single ambition and ignorance was such, then certainly united in a council it would be much more; and if the compendious recital of what they there did was so tedious and unprofitable, then surely to sit out the whole extent of their tattle in a dozen volumes, would be a loss of time irrecoverable. Besides that which I had read of St. Martin, who for his last sixteen years could never be perswaded to be at any council of the bishops. And Gregory Nazianzen betook him to the same resolution, affirming to Procopius, "that of any council or meeting of bishops he never saw good end; nor any remedy thereby of evil in the church, but rather an increase. For," saith he, "their contentions and desire of lording no tongue is able to express." I have not therefore, I confess, read more of the councils save here and there; I should be sorry to have been such a prodigal of my time: but that which is better, I can assure this confuter, I have read into them all. And if I want any thing yet, I shall reply something toward that which in the defence of Muræna was answered by Cicero to Sulpitius the lawyer. If ye provoke me (for at no hand else will I undertake such a frivolous labour) I will in three months be an expert councilist. For be not deceiv'd, readers, by men that would overawe your ears with big names and huge tomes that contradict and repeal one another, because they can cram a margin with citations. Do but winnow their chaff from their wheat, ye shall see their great heap shrink and wax thin past belief. From hence he passes to enquire wherefore I should blame the vices of the prelates only, seeing the inferior clergy is known to be as faulty. To which let him hear in brief; that those priests whose vices have been notorious, are all prelatical, which argues both the impiety of that opinion, and the wicked remissness of that government. We hear not of any which are called Nonconformists, that have been accused of scandalous living; but are known to be pious, or at least sober men. Which is a great good argument.

ment that they are in the truth, and prelates in the error. He would be resolved next, "What the corruptions of the universities concern the prelates?" and to that let him take this, that the remonstrant having spoken as if learning would decay with the removal of prelates, I shew'd him that while books were extant and in print, learning could not readily be at a worse pass in the universities than it was now under their government. Then he seeks to justify the pernicious sermons of the clergy, as if they upheld sovereignty, whenas all Christian sovereignty is by law, and to no other end but to the maintenance of the common good. But their doctrine was plainly the dissolution of law, which only sets up sovereignty, and the erecting of an arbitrary sway according to private will, to which they would enjoin a slavish obedience without law; which is the known definition of a tyrant, and a tyranniz'd people. A little beneath he denies that great riches in the Church are the baits of pride and ambition: of which error to undeceive him, I shall alledge a reputed divine authority, as ancient as Constantine, which his love to antiquity must not except against; and to add the more weight, he shall learn it rather in the words of our old poet Gower than in mine, that he may see it is no new opinion, but a truth deliver'd of old by a voice from heaven, and ratify'd by long experience.

" This Constantine which heath hath found,
 " Within Rome anon let found
 " Two Churches which he did make
 " For Peter and for Paul's sake:
 " Of whom he had a vision,
 " And gave thereto possession
 " Of lordship and of worlds good;
 " But how so that his will was good
 " Toward the Pope and his franchise,
 " Yet hath it proved otherwise
 " To see the working of the deed:
 " For in cronick thus I read,
 " Anon as he hath made the yest,
 " A voice was heard on high the left,
 " Of which all Rome was adrad,
 " And said, This day venim is shad
 " In holy Church, of temporall
 " That meddleth with the spiritual;
 " And how it stant in that degree,
 " Yet may a man the sooth see.
 " God amend it whan he will,
 " I can thereto none other skill."

But there were beasts of prey, saith he, before wealth was bestow'd on the Church. What though? because the vultures had then but small pickings, shall we therefore go and fling them a full gorge? if they for lucre use to creep into the Church undiscernably, the more wisdom will it be so to provide that no revenue there may exceed the golden mean: For so, good pastors will be content, as having need of no more, and knowing withal the precept and example of Christ and his Apostles, and also will be less tempted to ambition. The bad will have but small matter whereon to set their mischief awork: And the worst and fustl'ft heads will not come at all, when they shall see the crop nothing answerable to their capacious greediness: For small temptations allure but dribbling offenders; but a great purchase will call such as both are most able of themselves, and will be most enabled hereby to compass dangerous projects. But saith he, "A widow's house will tempt as well as a Bishop's palace." Acutely spoken! because neither we nor the Prelates can abolish widows houses, which are but an occasion taken of evil without the Church, therefore we shall set up within the Church a lottery of such prizes as are

the direct inviting causes of avarice and ambition, both unnecessary and harmful to be propos'd, and most easy, most convenient and needful to be remov'd. "Yea but they are in a wise dispenser's hand:" Let them be in whose hand they will, they are most apt to blind, to puff up and pervert the most seeming good. And how they have been kept from vultures, whatever the dispenser's care hath been, we have learn'd by our miseries. But this which comes next in view, I know not what good vein or humour took him when he let drop into his paper: I that was ere while the ignorant, the loyterer, on the sudden by his permission am now granted "to know something." And that "such a volley of expressions" he hath met withal, "as he would never desire to have them better cloth'd." For me, readers, although I cannot say that I am utterly untrain'd in those rules which best rhetoricians have given, or unacquainted with those examples which the prime authors of eloquence have written in any learned tongue; yet true eloquence I find to be none, but the serious and hearty love of truth: And that whose mind soever is fully possess'd with a fervent desire to know good things, and with the dearest charity to infuse the knowledge of them into others, when such a man would speak, his words (by what I can express) like so many nimble and airy servitors trip about him at command, and in well-order'd files, as he would wish, fall aptly into their own places. But now to the remainder of our discourse. Christ refus'd great riches, and large honours at the devil's hand. But why, saith he, "as they were tender'd by him from whom it was a sin to receive them." Timely remember'd: why is it not therefore as much a sin to receive a Liturgy of the masses' giving, were it for nothing else but for the giver? "But he could make no use of such a high estate," quoth the confuter; opportunely. For why then should the servant take upon him to use those things which his master had unfitted himself to use, that he might teach his ministers to follow his steps in the same ministry? But "they were offer'd him to a bad end:" So they prove to the Prelates, who after their preferment most usually change the teaching labour of the word, into the unteaching ease of lordship over consciences and purses. But he proceeds, "God entic'd the Israelites with the promise of Canaan:" Did not the prelates bring as slavish minds with them, as the Jews brought out of Egypt, they had left out that instance. Besides that it was then the time, whenas the best of them, as Saint Paul saith, "was shut up unto the faith under the law their school-master," who was forc'd to intice them as children with childish enticements. But the gospel is our manhood, and the Ministry should be the manhood of the gospel, not to look after, much less so basely to plead for earthly rewards. "But God incited the wisest man Solomon with these means." Ah confuter of thy self, this example hath undone thee; Solomon ask'd an understanding heart, which the prelates have little care to ask. He ask'd no riches, which is their chief care; therefore was the prayer of Solomon pleasing to God; he gave him wisdom at his request, and riches without asking, as now he gives the prelates riches at their seeking, and no wisdom because of their perverse asking. But he gives not over yet, "Moses had an eye to the reward." To what reward, thou man that look'st with Balaam's eyes? to what reward had the faith of Moses an eye? He that had forsaken all the greatness of Egypt, and chose a troublesome journey in his old age through the wilderness, and yet arriv'd not at his journey's end: His faithful eyes were fix'd upon that incorruptible reward, promis'd to Abraham and his seed in the Messiah; he sought a heavenly reward which could make him happy, and never hurt him, and to such a reward every good man may have a respect: But the prelates are eager of such rewards as cannot make them happy; but can only make them worse. Jacob, a prince born, vow'd, that if God would "but give him bread to eat, and raiment to put on, then the Lord should be his God." But the prelates of mean birth, and oft-times of lowest, making shew as if they were called to the spiritual and humble ministry of the Gospel, yet murmur, and think it a hard service, unless, contrary to the tenour of their profession, they may eat the bread and wear the honours of princes: So much more covetous and base they are than Simon Magus, for he proffer'd a reward to be admitted to that work, which they will not be meanly

meanly hir'd to. But faith he, "Are not the clergy members of Christ, why should not each member thrive alike?" Carnal textman! as if worldly thriving were one of the privileges we have by being in Christ, and were not a providence oft-times extended more liberally to the infidel than to the Christian. Therefore must the ministers of Christ not be over-rich or great in the world, because their calling is spiritual, not secular; because they have a special warfare, which is not to be entangled with many impediments; because their master Christ gave them this precept, and set them this example, told them this was the mystery of his coming, by mean things and persons to subdue mighty ones: and lastly, because a middle estate is most proper to the office of teaching, whereas higher dignity teaches far less, and blinds the teacher. Nay, faith the confuter, fetching his last endeavour, "The Prelates will be very loth to let go their baronies, and votes in Parliament," and calls it "God's cause," with an unsufferable impudence. "Not that they love the honours and the means," good men and generous! "but that they would not have their country made guilty of such a sacrilege and injustice! A worthy patriot for his own corrupt ends! That which he imputes as sacrilege to his country, is the only way left them to purge that abominable sacrilege out of the land, which none but the prelates are guilty of: Who for the discharge of one single duty receive and keep that which might be enough to satisfy the labours of many painful ministers better deserving than themselves: Who possess huge benefices for lazy performances, great promotions only for the execution of a cruel disgosselling jurisdiction: Who ingross many pluralities under a non-resident and slubbing dispatch of Souls: Who let hundreds of Parishes famish in one Diocese, while they the prelates are mute, and yet enjoy that wealth that would furnish all those dark places with able supply; and yet they eat, and yet they live at the rate of earls, and yet hoard up: They who chase away all the faithful shepherds of the flock, and bring in a dearth of spiritual food, robbing thereby the Church of her dearest treasure, and sending herds of souls starveling to hell, while they feast and riot upon the labours of hireling curates, consuming and purloining even that which by their foundation is allow'd, and left to the poor, and to reparations of the Church. These are they who have bound the land with the sin of sacrilege, from which mortal engagement we shall never be free, till we have totally remov'd with one labour, as one individual thing, prelaty and sacrilege. And herein will the king be a true defender of the faith, not by paring or lessening, but by distributing in due proportion the maintenance of the Church, that all parts of the land may equally partake the plentiful and diligent preaching of the faith, the scandal of ceremonies thrown out that delude and circumvent the faith; and the usurpation of prelates laid level, who are in words the fathers, but in their deeds the oppugners of the faith. This is that which will best confirm him in that glorious title. Thus ye have heard, readers, how many shifts and wiles the prelates have invented to save their ill-got booty. And if it be true, as in Scripture it is foretold, that pride and covetousness are the sure marks of those false prophets which are to come; then boldly conclude these to be as great seducers as any of the latter times. For between this and the judgment-day do not look for any arch deceivers, who in spite of reformation will use more craft, or less shame to defend their love of the world and their ambition, than these prelates have done. And if ye think that soundness of reason, or what force of argument soever will bring them to an ingenuous silence, ye think that which will never be. But if ye take that course which Erasmus was wont to say Luther took against the Pope and Monks; if ye denounce war against their miters and their bellies, ye shall soon discern that Turbant of pride which they wear upon their heads, to be no Helmet of Salvation, but the mere mettle and horn-work of papal jurisdiction: and that they have also this gift, like a certain kind of some that are possess'd, to have their voice in their bellies, which being well drain'd and taken down, their great oracle, which is only there, will soon be dumb; and the Divine Right of Episcopacy forthwith expiring, will put us no more to trouble with tedious antiquities and disputes.

OF
E D U C A T I O N.

To Master SAMUEL HARTLIB.

Master HARTLIB,

I Am long since persuaded, that to say or do aught worth memory and imitation, no purpose or respect should sooner move us than simply the love of God, and of mankind. Nevertheless to write now the reforming of education, though it be one of the greatest and noblest designs that can be thought on, and for the want whereof this nation perishes; I had not yet at this time been induc'd, but by your earnest entreaties, and serious conjurements: as having my mind for the present half diverted in the pursuance of some other assertions, the knowledge and the use of which cannot but be a great furtherance both to the enlargement of truth, and honest living with much more peace. Nor should the laws of any private friendship have prevail'd with me to divide thus, or transpose my former thoughts, but that I see those aims, those actions which have won you with me the esteem of a person sent hither by some good providence from a far country to be the occasion and incitement of great good to this island. And, as I hear, you have obtain'd the same repute with men of most approved wisdom, and some of the highest authority among us; not to mention the learned correspondence which you hold in foreign parts, and the extraordinary pains and diligence which you have us'd in this matter both here and beyond the seas; either by the definite will of God so ruling, or the peculiar sway of nature, which also is God's working. Neither can I think that so reputed, and so valued as you are, you would to the forfeit of your own discerning ability, impose upon me an unfit and over-ponderous argument; but that the satisfaction which you profess to have receiv'd from those incidental discourses which we have wander'd into, hath prest and almost constrain'd you into a persuasion, that what you require from me in this point, I neither ought, nor can in conscience defer beyond this time both of so much need at once, and so much opportunity to try what God hath determin'd. I will not resist therefore whatever it is, either of divine or human obligation, that you lay upon me; but will forthwith set down in writing, as you request me, that voluntary Idea, which hath long in silence presented itself to me, of a better education, in extent and comprehension far more large, and yet of time far shorter, and of attainment far more certain, than hath been yet in practice. Brief I shall endeavour to be: for that which I have to say, assuredly this nation hath extream need should be done sooner than spoken. To tell you therefore what I have benefited herein among old renowned authors, I shall spare; and to search what many modern Janua's and Didactics more than ever I shall read, have projected, my inclination leads me not. But if you can accept of these few observations which have flowered off, and are as it were the burnishing of many studious and contemplative years altogether spent in the search of religious and civil knowledge, and such as pleas'd you so well in the relating, I here give you them to dispose of.

The end then of learning is to repair the ruins of our first parents by regaining to know God aright, and out of that knowledge to love him, to imitate him, to be like him, as we may the nearest by possessing our souls of true vertue, which being united to the heavenly grace of faith, makes up the highest perfection. But because our understanding cannot in this body found itself but on sensible things, nor arrive so clearly to the know-

ledge of God and things invisible, as by orderly conning over the visible and inferior creature, the same method is necessarily to be followed in all discreet teaching. And seeing every nation affords not experience and tradition enough for all kind of learning, therefore we are chiefly taught the languages of those people who have at any time been most industrious after wisdom: so that language is but the instrument conveying to us things useful to be known. And though a linguist should pride himself to have all the tongues that Babel cleft the world into, yet if he have not studied the solid things in them as well as the words and Lexicons, he were nothing so much to be esteem'd a learned man, as any yeoman or tradesman competently wise in his mother-dialect only. Hence appear the many mistakes which have made learning generally so unpleasing and so unsuccessful: first, we do amiss to spend seven or eight years meerly in scraping together so much miserable Latin and Greek, as might be learn'd otherwise easily and delightfully in one year. And that which casts our proficiency therein so much behind, is our time lost partly in too oft idle vacancies given both to schools and universities; partly in a preposterous exaction, forcing the empty wits of children to compose themes, verses and orations, which are the acts of ripest judgment, and the final work of a head filled by long reading and observing, with elegant maxims and copious invention. These are not matters to be wrung from poor striplings, like blood out of the nose, or the plucking of untimely fruit: besides the ill habit which they get of wretched barbarizing against the Latin and Greek Idiom, with their untutor'd Anglicisms, odious to be read, yet not to be avoided without a well-continued and judicious conversing among pure authors digested, which they scarce taste: Whereas, if after some preparatory grounds of speech by their certain forms got into memory, they were led to the praxis thereof in some chosen short book lesson'd thoroughly to them, they might then forthwith proceed to learn the substance of good things, and arts in due order, which would bring the whole language quickly into their power. This I take to be the most rational and most profitable way of learning languages, and whereby we may best hope to give account to God of our youth spent herein. And for the usual method of teaching arts, I deem it to be an old error of universities, not yet well recover'd from the scholastic grossness of barbarous ages, that instead of beginning with arts most easy, (and those be such as are most obvious to the sense,) they present their young unmatriculated novices at first coming with the most intellectual abstractions of logic and metaphysics: so that they having but newly left those grammatic flats and shallows where they stuck unreasonably to learn a few words with lamentable construction, and now on the sudden transported under another climate to be toss'd and turmoil'd with their unballasted wits in fathomless and unquiet deeps of controversy, do for the most part grow into hatred and contempt of learning, mock'd and deluded all this while with ragged notions and babblements, while they expected worthy and delightful knowledge; till poverty or youthful years call them importunately their several ways, and hasten them with the sway of friends either to an ambitious and mercenary, or ignorantly zealous divinity: some allur'd to the trade of law, grounding their purposes not on the prudent and heavenly contemplation of justice and equity, which was never taught them, but on the promising and pleasing thoughts of litigious terms, fat contentions, and flowing fees: others betake them to state-affairs, with souls so unprincipled in virtue, and true generous breeding, that flattery and court-shifts and tyrannous aphorisms appear to them the highest points of wisdom; instilling their barren hearts with a conscientious slavery; if, as I rather think, it be not feign'd. Others, lastly, of a more delicious and airy spirit, retire themselves, (knowing no better) to the enjoyments of ease and luxury, living out their days in feast and jollity: which indeed is the wisest and the safest course of all these, unless they were with more integrity undertaken. * And these are the errors, and these are the

* Thus it is in the first edition.

fruits of mis-spending our prime youth at the schools and universities as we do, either in learning meer words, or such things chiefly as were better unlearned.

I shall detain you now no longer in the demonstration of what we should not do, but strait conduct you to a hill-side, where I will point you out the right path of a virtuous and noble education: laborious indeed at the first ascent, but else so smooth, so green, so full of goodly prospect, and melodious sounds on every side, that the harp of Orpheus was not more charming. I doubt not but ye shall have more ado to drive our dullest and laziest youth, our stocks and stubs, from the infinite desire of such a happy nurture, than we have now to hale and drag our choicest and hopefullest wits to that asinine feast of fowthistles and brambles which is commonly set before them, as all the food and entertainment of their tenderest and most docible age. I call therefore a compleat and generous education, that which fits a man to perform justly, skilfully and magnanimously all the offices both private and public, of peace and war. And how all this may be done between twelve, and one and twenty, less time than is now bestowed in pure trifling at grammar and sophistry, is to be thus ordered.

First, to find out a spacious house and ground about it fit for an Academy, and big enough to lodge a hundred and fifty persons, whereof twenty or thereabout may be attendants, all under the government of one, who shall be thought of desert sufficient, and ability either to do all, or wisely to direct and oversee it done. This place should be at once both school and university, not needing a remove to any other house of scholarship, except it be some peculiar college of law, or physick, where they mean to be practitioners: but as for those general studies which take up all our time from Lilly to the commencing as they term it, master of art, it should be absolute. After this pattern, as many edifices may be converted to this use as shall be needful in every city throughout this land, which would tend much to the encrease of learning and civility every where. This number, less or more thus collected, to the convenience of a foot-company, or interchangeably two troops of cavalry, should divide their day's work into three parts as it lies orderly: their studies, their exercise, and their diet.

For their studies: first, they should begin with the chief and necessary rules of some good grammar, either that now used, or any better: and while this is doing, their speech is to be fashioned to a distinct and clear pronunciation, as near as may be to the Italian, especially in the vowels. For we Englishmen being far northerly, do not open our mouths in the cold air, wide enough to grace a southern tongue; but are observ'd by all other nations to speak exceeding close and inward: so that to smatter Latin with an English mouth, is as ill a hearing as law French. Next, to make them expert in the usefullest points of grammar; and withal to season them and win them early to the love of virtue and true labour, ere any flattering seducement, or vain principle seize them wandering, some easy and delightful book of education would be read to them: whereof the Greeks have store, as Cebes, Plutarch, and other Socratic discourses. But in Latin we have none of classic authority extant, except the two or three first books of Quintilian, and some select pieces elsewhere. But here the main skill and ground-work will be, to temper them such lectures and explanations upon every opportunity, as may lead and draw them in willing obedience, enflamed with the study of learning, and the admiration of virtue; stirr'd up with high hopes of living to be brave men, and worthy patriots, dear to God, and famous to all ages. That they may despise and scorn all their childish and ill-taught qualities, to delight in manly and liberal exercises: which he who hath the art and proper eloquence to catch them with, what with mild and effectual persuasions, and what with the intimation of some fear, if need be, but chiefly by his own example, might in a short space gain them to an incredible diligence and courage: infusing into their young breasts such an ingenuous and noble ardour, as would not fail to make many of them renowned and matchless men. At the same time, some other hour
of

of the day, might be taught them the rules of arithmetic, and soon after the elements of geometry, even playing, as the old manner was. After evening repast, till bed-time, their thoughts would be best taken up in the easy grounds of religion, and the story of scripture. The next step would be to the authors of Agriculture, Cato, Varro, and Columella, for the matter is most easy; and if the language be difficult, so much the better, it is not a difficulty above their years. And here will be an occasion of inciting and enabling them hereafter to improve the tillage of their country, to recover the bad soil, and to remedy the waste that is made of good: for this was one of Hercules's praises. Ere half these authors be read (which will soon be with plying hard and daily) they cannot chuse but be masters of any ordinary prose. So that it will be then seasonable for them to learn in any modern author the use of the globes, and all the maps; first with the old names, and then with the new: or they might be then capable to read any compendious method of natural philosophy. And at the same time might be entering into the Greek tongue, after the same manner as was before prescribed in the Latin; whereby the difficulties of grammar being soon overcome, all the historical physiology of Aristotle and Theophrastus are open before them, and, as I may say, under contribution. The like access will be to Vitruvius, to Seneca's natural questions, to Mela, Celsus, Pliny, or Solinus. And having thus past the principles of Arithmetic, Geometry, Astronomy, and Geography, with a general compact of physics, they may descend in Mathematics to the instrumental science of Trigonometry, and from thence to fortification, architecture, enginry, or navigation. And in natural philosophy they may proceed leisurely from the history of meteors, minerals, plants, and living creatures, as far as anatomy. Then also in course might be read to them out of some not tedious writer the institution of physic; that they may know the tempers, the humours, the seasons, and how to manage a crudity: which he who can wisely and timely do, is not only a great physician to himself and to his friends, but also may at sometime or other, save an army by this frugal and expensless means only: and not let the healthy and stout bodies of young men rot away under him for want of this discipline; which is a great pity, and no less a shame to the commander. To set forward all these proceedings in nature and mathematics, what hinders but that they may procure, as oft as shall be needful, the helpful experiences of hunters, fowlers, fishermen, shepherds, gardeners, apothecaries; and in the other sciences, architects, engineers, mariners, anatomists: who doubtless would be ready, some for reward, and some to favour such a hopeful seminary. And this will give them such a real tincture of natural knowledge, as they shall never forget, but daily augment with delight. Then also those poets which are now counted most hard, will be both facil and pleasant, Orpheus, Hesiod, Theocritus, Aratus, Nicander, Ovid, Dionysius, and in Latin Lucretius, Manilius, and the rural part of Virgil.

By this time, years and good general precepts will have furnish'd them more distinctly with that act of reason which in Ethics is called Proairesis: that they may with some judgment contemplate upon moral good and evil. Then will be required a special reinforcement of constant and sound endoctrinating to set them right and firm, instructing them more amply in the knowledge of virtue and the hatred of vice: while their young and pliant affections are led through all the moral works of Plato, Xenophon, Cicero, Plutarch, Laertius, and those Locrian remnants; but still to be reduced in their nightward studies wherewith they close the day's work, under the determinate sentence of David or Solomon, or the evangels and apostolic scriptures. Being perfect in the knowledge of personal duty, they may then begin the study of oeconomics. And either now or before this, they may have easily learned at any odd hour the Italian tongue. And soon after, but with wariness and good antidote, it would be wholesome enough to let them taste some choice comedies, Greek, Latin, or Italian: those tragedies also that treat of household matters, as Trachiniae, Alcestis, and the like. The next remove must be to the study of Politics; to know the beginning, end, and reasons of political societies;

societies; that they may not in a dangerous fit of the commonwealth be such poor, shaken, uncertain reeds of such a tottering conscience, as many of our great counsellors have lately shewn themselves, but steadfast pillars of the state. After this, they are to dive into the grounds of law, and legal justice; deliver'd first and with best warrant by Moses; and as far as human prudence can be trusted, in those extolled remains of Grecian law-givers, Lycurgus, Solon, Zaleucus, Charondas, and thence to all the Roman Edicts and Tables with their Justinian; and so down to the Saxon and common laws of England, and the statutes. Sundays also and every evening may be now understandingly spent in the highest matters of Theology, and church-history ancient and modern: and ere this time the Hebrew tongue at a set hour might have been gained, that the scriptures may be now read in their own original: whereto it would be no impossibility to add the Chaldee, and the Syrian dialect. When all these employments are well conquered, then will the choice histories, Heroic Poems, and Attic Tragedies of stateliest and most regal argument, with all the famous political orations, offer themselves: which if they were not only read, but some of them got by memory, and solemnly pronounc'd with right accent and grace, as might be taught, would endue them even with the spirit and vigour of Demosthenes or Cicero, Euripides, or Sophocles. And now lastly; will be the time to read with them those organic arts which enable men to discourse and write perspicuously, elegantly, and according to the fitted stile of lofty, mean, or lowly. Logic therefore, so much as is useful, is to be referr'd to this due place with all her well-coucht heads and topics, until it be time to open her contracted palm into a graceful and ornate rhetoric taught out of the rule of Plato, Aristotle, Phalereus, Cicero, Hermogenes, Longinus. To which poetry would be made subsequent, or indeed rather precedent, as being less subtle and fine, but more simple, sensuous, and passionate. I mean not here the prosody of a verse, which they could not but have hit on before among the rudiments of grammar; but that sublime art which in Aristotle's Poetics, in Horace, and the Italian commentaries of Castlevetro, Tasso, Mazzoni, and others, teaches what the laws are of a true Epic poem, what of a Dramatic, what of a Lyric, what decorum is, which is the grand master-piece to observe. This would make them soon perceive what despicable creatures our common rhimers and play-writers be; and shew them what religious, what glorious and magnificent use might be made of poetry both in divine and human things. From hence, and not till now, will be the right season of forming them to be able writers and composers in every excellent matter, when they shall be thus fraught with an universal insight into things. Or whether they be to speak in parliament or council, honour and attention would be waiting on their lips. There would then also appear in pulpits other visages, other gestures, and stuff otherwise wrought than what we now sit under, oftentimes to as great a trial of our patience as any other that they preach to us. These are the studies wherein our noble and our gentle youth ought to bestow their time in a disciplinary way from twelve to one and twenty; unless they rely more upon their ancestors dead, than upon themselves living. In which methodical course it is so supposed they must proceed by the steady pace of learning onward, as at convenient times for memory's sake to retire back into the middle ward, and sometimes into the rear of what they have been taught, until they have confirmed and solidly united the whole body of their perfected knowledge, like the last embattelling of a Roman legion. Now will be worth the seeing, what exercises and recreations may best agree, and become these studies.

THEIR EXERCISE.

The course of study hitherto briefly described, is, what I can guess by reading, likest to those ancient and famous schools of Pythagoras, Plato, Isocrates, Aristotle and such others, out of which were bred such a number of renowned philosophers, orators, historians, poets, and princes all over Greece, Italy and Asia, besides the flourishing studies

dies of Cyrene and Alexandria. But herein it shall exceed them, and supply a defect as great as that which Plato noted in the commonwealth of Sparta: whereas that city trained up their youth most for war, and these in their academies and Lycæum, all for the gown, this institution of breeding which I here delineate shall be equally good both for peace and war. Therefore about an hour and a half ere they eat at noon should be allowed them for exercise, and due rest afterwards: but the time for this may be enlarged at pleasure, according as their rising in the morning shall be early. The exercise which I commend first, is the exact use of their weapon, to guard, and to strike safely with edge or point; this will keep them healthy, nimble, strong and well in breath, is also the likeliest means to make them grow large and tall, and to inspire them with a gallant and fearless courage, which being tempered with seasonable lectures and precepts to them of true fortitude and patience, will turn into a native and heroic valour, and make them hate the cowardice of doing wrong. They must be also practised in all the locks and gripes of wrestling, wherein Englishmen were wont to excel, as need may often be in fight to tug, to grapple, and to close. And this perhaps will be enough, wherein to prove and heat their single strength. The interim of unsweating themselves regularly, and convenient rest before meat, may both with profit and delight be taken up in recreating and composing their travailed spirits with the solemn and divine harmonies of music heard or learned; either whilst the skilful Organist plies his grave and fancied descant in lofty fugues, or the whole symphony with artful and unimaginable touches adorn and grace the well-studied chords of some choice composer; sometimes the lute or soft organ stop waiting on elegant voices either to religious, martial or civil ditties: which, if wise men and prophets be not extreamly out, have a great power over dispositions and manners, to smooth and make them gentle from rustic harshness and distemper'd passions. The like also would not be unexpedient after meat, to assist and cherish nature in her first concoction, and send their minds back to study in good tune and satisfaction. Where having follow'd it close under vigilant eyes, till about two hours before supper, they are by a sudden alarum or watch-word, to be called out to their military motions, under sky or covert, according to the season, as was the Roman wont; first on foot, then as their age permits, on horseback, to all the art of cavalry: that having in sport, but with much exactness and daily muster, served out the rudiments of their soldiery in all the skill of embattelling, marching, encamping, fortifying, besieging, and battering, with all the helps of ancient and modern stratagems, Tactics, and warlike maxims, they may as it were out of a long war come forth renowned and perfect commanders in the service of their country. They would not then, if they were trusted with fair and hopeful armies, suffer them for want of just and wise discipline to shed away from about them like sick feathers, though they be never so oft supplied: they would not suffer their empty and unrecrutable colonels of twenty men in a company, to quaff out, or convey into secret hoards, the wages of a delusive list, and a miserable remnant: yet in the mean while to be over-mastered with a score or two of drunkards, the only soldiery left about them, or else to comply with all rapines and violences. No certainly, if they knew ought of that knowledge that belongs to good men or good governors, they would not suffer these things. But to return to our own institute: besides these constant exercises at home, there is another opportunity of gaining experience to be won from pleasure itself abroad: in those vernal seasons of the year, when the air is calm and pleasant, it were an injury and fullness against nature not to go out and see her riches, and partake in her rejoicing with Heaven and Earth. I should not therefore be a persuader to them of studying much then, after two or three years that they have well laid their grounds, but to ride out in companies with prudent and staid guides to all the quarters of the land; learning and observing all places of strength, all commodities of building and of soil, for towns and tillage, harbours and ports for trade. Sometimes taking sea as far as to our navy, to learn there also what they can

in the practical knowledge of sailing and of sea-fight. These ways would try all their peculiar gifts of nature, and if there were any secret excellence among them would fetch it out, and give it fair opportunities to advance itself by, which could not but mightily redound to the good of this nation, and bring into fashion again those old admired virtues and excellencies with far more advantage now in this purity of christian knowledge. Nor shall we then need the Monsieurs of Paris to take our hopeful youth into their slight and prodigal custodies, and send them over back again transformed into mimics, apes, and keeshose. But if they desire to see other countries at three or four and twenty years of age, not to learn principles, but to enlarge experience, and make wise observation, they will by that time be such as shall deserve the regard and honour of all men where they pass, and the society and friendship of those in all places who are best and most eminent. And perhaps then other nations will be glad to visit us for their breeding, or else to imitate us in their own country.

Now lastly for their diet there cannot be much to say, save only that it would be best in the same house; for much time else would be lost abroad, and many ill habits got: and that it should be plain, healthful and moderate, I suppose is out of controversy. Thus, Mr. Hartlib, you have a general view in writing, as your desire was, of that which at several times I had discoursed with you concerning the best and noblest way of education; not beginning as some have done, from the cradle, which yet might be worth many considerations, if brevity had not been my scope: many other circumstances also I could have mentioned, but this to such as have the worth in them to make trial, for light and direction may be enough. Only I believe that this is not a bow for every man to shoot in, that counts himself a teacher; but will require sinews almost equal to those which Homer gave Ulysses: yet I am withal persuaded that it may prove much more easy in the assay, than it now seems at distance, and much more illustrious: howbeit, not more difficult than I imagine, and that imagination presents me with nothing but very happy, and very possible according to best wishes; if God have so decreed, and this age have spirit and capacity enough to apprehend.

AREOPAGITICA:

A SPEECH for the Liberty of Unlicens'd PRINTING,

To the PARLIAMENT of ENGLAND.

Τελείθερον δ' ἐκεῖνο, εἰ τις θέλει πόλει
Χρησόν τι βάλειν εἰς μέσον φέρειν, ἔχων.
Καὶ ταῦθ' ὁ χεῖρ' ἔχων, λαμπρὸς ἐσθ', ὁ μὴ θέλων,
Σιγᾷ, τί τέτων ἐστὶν ἰσαίτερον πόλει;

Euripid. Hicetid.

This is true Liberty, when free-born men,
Having to advise the public, may speak free,
Which he who can, and will, deserves high praise;
Who neither can nor will may hold his peace;
What can be juster in a state than this?

Euripid. Hicetid.

THEY, who to states and governors of the commonwealth direct their speech, high court of parliament! or wanting such access in a private condition, write that which they foresee may advance the public good; I suppose them, as at the beginning of no mean endeavour, not a little altered and mov'd inwardly in their minds: Some with doubt of what will be the success, others with fear of what will be the censure; some with hope, others with confidence of what they have to speak. And me perhaps each of these dispositions, as the subject was whereon I entered, may have at other times variously affected; and likely might in these foremost expressions, now also disclose which of them sway'd most, but that the very attempt of this address thus made, and the thought of whom it hath recourse to, hath got the power within me to a passion, far more welcome than incidental to a preface. Which though I stay not to confess ere any ask, I shall be blameless, if it be no other, than the joy and gratulation which it brings to all who wish and promote their country's liberty; whereof this whole discourse proposed will be a certain testimony, if not a trophy. For this is not the liberty which we can hope, that no grievance ever should arise in the commonwealth, that let no man in this world expect; but when complaints are freely heard, deeply considered, and speedily reform'd, then is the utmost bound of civil liberty attain'd, that wise men look for. To which if I now manifest, by the very sound of this which I shall utter, that we are already in good part arrived, and yet from such a steep disadvantage of tyranny and superstition grounded into our principles, as was beyond the manhood of a Roman recovery, it will be attributed first, as is most due, to the strong assistance of God, our deliverer; next, to your faithful guidance and undaunted wisdom, lords and commons of England! Neither is it in God's esteem, the diminution of his glory, when honourable things are spoken of good men, and worthy magistrates; which if I now first should begin to do, after so fair a progress of your laudable deeds, and such a long obligation upon the whole realm to your indefatigable virtues, I might be justly reckon'd among the tardiest, and the unwillingest of them that praise ye. Nevertheless there be
ing

ing three principal things, without which all praising is but courtship and flattery, first, when that only is praised which is solidly worth praise; next, when greatest likelihoods are brought, that such things, are truly and really in those persons, to whom they are ascribed; the other, when he who praises, by shewing that such his actual persuasion is of whom he writes, can demonstrate that he flatters not: the former two of these I have heretofore endeavoured, rescuing the employment from him who went about to impair your merits, with a trivial and malignant Encomium; the latter as belonging chiefly to mine own acquittal, that whom I so extolled I did not flatter, hath been reserv'd opportunely to this occasion. For he who freely magnifies what hath been nobly done, and fears not to declare as freely what might be done better, gives ye the best covenant of his fidelity; and that his loyalest affection and his hope waits on your proceedings. His highest praising is not flattery, and his plainest advice is a kind of praising: for though I should affirm and hold by argument, that it would fare better with truth, with learning, and the commonwealth, if one of your publish'd orders which I should name, were called in; yet at the same time it could not but much redound to the lustre of your mild and equal government, whenas private persons are hereby animated to think ye better pleased with publick advice, than other statists have been delighted heretofore with public flattery. And men will then see what difference there is between the magnanimity of a triennial parliament, and that jealous haughtiness of prelates and cabin counsellors that usurp'd of late, whenas they shall observe ye in the midst of your victories and successes more gently brooking written exceptions against a voted order, than other courts, which had produced nothing worth memory but the weak ostentation of wealth, would have endured the least signified dislike at any sudden proclamation. If I should thus far presume upon the meek demeanour of your civil and gentle greatness, lords and commons! as what your publish'd order hath directly said, that to gainsay, I might defend myself with ease, if any should accuse me of being new or insolent, did they but know how much better I find ye esteem it to imitate the old and elegant humanity of Greece, than the barbaric pride of a Hunnish and Norwegian stateliness. And out of those ages, to whose polite wisdom and letters we owe that we are not yet Goths and Jutlanders, I could name him who from his private house wrote that discourse to the parliament of Athens, that persuades them to change the form of Democracy which was then established. Such honour was done in those days to men who professed the study of wisdom and eloquence, not only in their own country, but in other lands, that cities and signories heard them gladly, and with great respect, if they had aught in public to admonish the state. Thus did Dion Prusæus, a stranger, and a private orator, counsel the Rhodians against a former edict: and I abound with other like examples, which to set here would be superfluous. But if from the industry of a life wholly dedicated to studious labours, and those natural endowments haply not the worst for two and fifty degrees of northern latitude, so much must be derogated, as to count me not equal to any of those who had this privilege, I would obtain to be thought not so inferior, as yourselves are superior to the most of them who receiv'd their counsel; and how far you excel them, be assured, lords and commons! there can no greater testimony appear, than when your prudent spirit acknowledges and obeys the voice of reason, from what quarter soever it be heard speaking; and renders ye as willing to repeal any act of your own setting forth, as any set forth by your predecessors.

If ye be thus resolved, as it were injury to think ye were not, I know not what should withhold me from presenting ye with a fit instance wherein to shew both that love of truth which ye eminently profess, and that uprightness of your judgment which is not wont to be partial to yourselves; by judging over again that order which ye have ordained "to regulate printing: that no book, pamphlet, or paper shall be henceforth printed, unless the same be first approved and licens'd by such, or at least one of such, as shall be thereto appointed." For that part which preserves justly every man's copy to himself,

himself, or provides for the poor, I touch not; only wish they be not made pretences to abuse and persecute honest and painful men, who offend not in either of these particulars. But that other clause of licensing books, which we thought had died with his brother quadragesimal and matrimonial when the prelates expired, I shall now attend with such a homily, as shall lay before ye, first the inventors of it to be those whom ye will be loth to own; next, what is to be thought in general of reading, whatever sort the books be; and that this order avails nothing to the suppressing of scandalous, seditious, and libellous books, which were mainly intended to be suppressed. Last, that it will be primely to the discouragement of all learning, and the stop of truth, not only by dis-exercising and blunting our abilities, in what we know already, but by hindring and cropping the discovery that might be yet further made, both in religious and civil wisdom.

I deny not, but that it is of greatest concernment in the church and commonwealth, to have a vigilant eye how books demean themselves as well as men; and thereafter to confine, imprison, and do sharpest justice on them as malefactors: for books are not absolutely dead things, but do contain a potency of life in them to be as active as that soul was whose progeny they are; nay, they do preserve as in a vial the purest efficacy and extraction of that living intellect that bred them. I know they are as lively, and as vigorously productive, as those fabulous dragons teeth; and being sown up and down, may chance to spring up armed men. And yet on the other hand, unless wariness be used, as good almost kill a man as kill a good book: who kills a man kills a reasonable creature, God's image; but he who destroys a good book, kills reason itself, kills the image of God, as it were in the eye. Many a man lives a burden to the earth; but a good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, imbalm'd and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life. 'Tis true, no age can restore a life, whereof perhaps there is no great loss; and revolutions of ages do not oft recover the loss of a rejected truth, for the want of which whole nations fare the worse. We should be wary therefore what persecution we raise against the living labours of public men, how we spill that seasoned life of man, preserved and stored up in books; since we see a kind of homicide may be thus committed, sometimes a martyrdom; and if it extend to the whole impression, a kind of massacre, whereof the execution ends not in the slaying of an elemental life, but strikes at the æthereal and fifth essence, the breath of reason itself; slays an immortality rather than a life. But lest I should be condemned of introducing licence, while I oppose licensing, I refuse not the pains to be so much historical, as will serve to shew what hath been done by ancient and famous commonwealths, against this disorder, till the very time that this project of licensing crept out of the Inquisition, was catch'd up by our prelates, and hath caught some of our presbyters.

In Athens, where books and wits were ever busier than in any other part of Greece, I find but only two sorts of writings which the magistrate cared to take notice of; those either blasphemous and atheistical, or libellous. Thus the books of Protagoras were by the judges of Areopagus, commanded to be burnt, and himself banished the territory for a discourse, begun with his confessing not to know, "whether there were gods, or whether not." And against defaming, it was agreed that none should be traduced by name, as was the manner of *Vetus Comœdia*, whereby we may guess how they censured libelling: and this course was quick enough, as Cicero writes, to quell both the desperate wits of other atheists, and the open way of defaming, as the event shewed. Of other sects and opinions, though tending to voluptuousness, and the denying of divine providence, they took no heed. Therefore we do not read that either Epicurus, or that libertine school of Cyrene, or what the Cynic impudence uttered, was ever questioned by the laws. Neither is it recorded, that the writings of those old comedians were suppressed, though the acting of them were forbid; and that Plato commended the reading of Aristophanes, the loosest of them all, to his royal scholar Dionysius, is commonly known, and may be excused, if holy Chrysostom, as is reported, nightly studied so much the same author, and had the art

art to cleanse a scurrilous vehemence, into the stile of a rousing sermon. That other leading city of Greece, Lacedæmon, considering that Lycurgus their Law-giver was so addicted to elegant learning, as to have been the first that brought out of Ionia the scattered works of Homer, and sent the poet Thales from Crete to prepare and mollify the Spartan furliness with his smooth songs and odes, the better to plant among them law and civility; it is to be wonder'd how useles and unbookish they were, minding nought but the feats of war. There needed no lincensing of books among them, for they disliked all but their own Laconic Apothegms, and took a slight occasion to chase Archilocus out of their city, perhaps for composing in a higher strain than their own soldiery ballads and roundels could reach to: or if it were for his broad verses, they were not therein so cautious, but they were as dissolute in their promiscuous conversing; whence Euripides affirms in *Andromache*, that their women were all unchaste. Thus much may give us light after what sort books were prohibited among the Greeks. The Romans also for many ages trained up only to a military roughness, resembling most the Lacedæmonian guise, knew of learning little but what their twelve tables, and the Pontific college with their Augurs and Flamins taught them in religion and law; so unacquainted with other learning, that when Carneades and Critolaus, with the Stoic Diogenes coming Embassadors to Rome, took thereby occasion to give the city a taste of their philosophy, they were suspected for seducers by no less a man than Cato the Censor, who moved it in the senate to dismiss them speedily, and to banish all such Attic babblers out of Italy. But Scipio and others of the noblest senators withstood him and his old Sabin austerity; honoured and admired the men; and the censor himself at last in his old age fell to the study of that whereof before he was so scrupulous. And yet at the same time, Nævius and Plautus, the first Latin comedians, had filled the city with all the borrowed scenes of Menander and Philemon. Then began to be considered there also what was to be done to libellous books and authors; for Nævius was quickly cast into prison for his unbridled pen, and released by the Tribunes upon his recantation: we read also that libels were burnt, and the makers punish'd by Augustus. The like severity, no doubt, was used, if aught were impiously written against their esteemed gods. Except in these two points, how the world went in books, the magistrate kept no reck'ning. And therefore Lucretius, without impeachment, verifies his Epicurism to Memmius, and had the honour to be set forth the second time by Cicero, so great a father of the commonwealth; although himself disputes against that opinion in his own writings. Nor was the satirical sharpness, or naked plainness of Lucilius, or Catullus, or Flaccus, by any order prohibited. And for matters of state, the story of Titus Livius, though it extoll'd that part which Pompey held, was not therefore suppressed by Octavius Cæsar, of the other faction. But that Naso was by him banished in his old age, for the wanton poems of his youth, was but a meer covert of state over some secret cause: and besides, the books were neither banished nor called in. From hence we shall meet with little else but tyranny in the Roman empire, that we may not marvel, if not so often bad, as good books were silenced. I shall therefore deem to have been large enough, in producing what among the ancients was punishable to write, save only which, all other arguments were free to treat on.

By this time the emperors were become christians, whose discipline in this point I do not find to have been more severe than what was formerly in practice. The books of those whom they took to be grand heretics were examined, refuted, and condemned in the general councils; and not till then were prohibited, or burnt by authority of the emperor. As for the writings of heathen authors, unless they were plain invectives against christianity, as those of Porphyrius and Proclus, they met with no interdict that can be cited, till about the year 400, in a Carthaginian council, wherein bishops themselves were forbid to read the books of gentiles, but heresies they might read: while others long before them on the contrary scrupled more the books of heretics, than of Gentiles. And that the primitive councils and bishops were wont only to declare what books were not commendable, passing no further, but leaving it to each one's conscience to read or to lay by, till after the year 800,

observed already by Padre Paolo the great unmasker of the Trentine council. After which time the popes of Rome engrossing what they pleased of political rule into their own hands, extended their dominion over men's eyes, as they had before over their judgments, burning and prohibiting to be read what they fancied not; yet sparing in their censures, and the books not many which they so dealt with: till Martin the 5th, by his bull not only prohibited, but was the first that excommunicated the reading of heretical books; for about that time Wickliff and Huffle growing terrible, were they who first drove the Papal court to a stricter policy of prohibiting. Which course Leo the 10th, and his successors followed, until the council of Trent, and the Spanish Inquisition engendering together, brought forth, or perfected those catalogues, and expurging indexes that rake through the entrails of many an old good author, with a violation worse than any could be offered to his tomb. Nor did they stay in matters heretical, but any subject that was not to their palate, they either condemned in a prohibition, or had it strait into the new purgatory of an index. To fill up the measure of encroachment, their last invention was to ordain that no book, pamphlet or paper, should be printed (as if St. Peter had bequeath'd them the keys of the press also, as well as of paradise) unless it were approved and licensed under the hands of two or three gluttonous friers. For example:

Let the chancellor Cini be pleased to see if in this present work be contained aught that may withstand the printing;

Vincent Rabbata, vicar of Florence.

I have seen this present work, and find nothing athwart the catholic faith and good manners: in witness whereof I have given, &c.

Nicolo Cini, chancellor of Florence.

Attending the precedent relation, it is allowed that this present work of Davanzati may be printed,

Vincent Rabatta, &c.

It may be printed, July 15.

Friar Simon Mompei d'Amelia, chancellor of the holy office in Florence.

Sure they have a conceit, if he of the bottomless pit had not long since broke prison, that this quadruple exorcism would bar him down. I fear their next design will be to get into their custody, the licensing of that which they say * Claudius intended, but went not through with. Vouchsafe to see another of their forms, the Roman stamp:

Imprimatur, If it seem good to the reverend master of the holy palace,

Belcastro, vicegerent.

Imprimatur,

Friar Nicholo Rodolphi master of the holy palace.

Sometimes five Imprimaturs are seen together dialogue-wise in the piazza of one title-page, complementing and ducking each to other with their shaven reverences, whether the author, who stands by in perplexity at the foot of his epistle, shall to the press or to the sponge. These are the pretty responsories, these are the dear antiphonies that so bewitched of late our prelates and their chaplains, with the goodly echo they made; and besotted us to the gay imitation of a lordly Imprimatur, one from Lambeth-house, another from the west-end of Paul's; so apishly romanizing, that the word of command still was set down in Latin; as if the learned grammatical pen that wrote it, would cast no ink without La-

* Quo veniam daret flatum crepitumque ventris in convivio emittendi.

Sueton in Clau dio.

tin: or perhaps, as they thought, because no vulgar tongue was worthy to express the pure conceit of an Imprimatur: but rather, as I hope, for that our English, the language of men ever famous and foremost in the achievements of liberty, will not easily find servile letters enow to spell such a dictatory presumption English'd. And thus ye have the inventors, and the original of book-licensing ript up, and drawn as lineally as any pedigree. We have it not, that can be heard of, from any ancient state, or polity, or church, nor by any statute left us by our ancestors elder or later; nor from the modern custom of any reformed city or church abroad; but from the most antichristian counsel, and the most tyrannous inquisition that ever inquired. Till then books were ever as freely admitted into the world as any other birth; the issue of the brain was no more stifled than the issue of the womb: no envious Juno fate cross-legged over the nativity of any man's intellectual offspring; but if it proved a monster, who denies, but that it was justly burnt, or sunk into the sea. But that a book in worse condition than a peccant soul, should be to stand before a jury ere it be born to the world, and undergo yet in darkness the judgment of Radamanth and his colleagues, ere it can pass the ferry backward into light, was never heard before, till that mysterious iniquity, provoked and troubled at the first entrance of reformation, sought out new limbo's and new hells wherein they might include our books also within the number of their damned. And this was the rare morsel so officiously snatched up, and so ill-favour'dly imitated by our inquisitorial bishops, and the attendant minorities their chaplains. That ye like not now these most certain authors of this licensing order, and that all sinister intention was far distant from your thoughts, when ye were importuned the passing it, all men who know the integrity of your actions, and how ye honour truth, will clear ye readily.

But some will say, what though the inventors were bad, the thing for all that may be good? It may so; yet if that thing be no such deep invention, but obvious and easy for any man to light on, and yet best and wisest commonwealths through all ages and occasions have forborn to use it, and falsest seducers and oppressors of men were the first who took it up, and to no other purpose but to obstruct and hinder the first approach of reformation; I am of those who believe, it will be a harder alchymy than Lullius ever knew, to sublimate any good use out of such an invention. Yet this only is what I request to gain from this reason, that it may be held a dangerous and suspicious fruit, as certainly it deserves, for the tree that bore it, until I can dissect one by one the properties it has. But I have first to finish, as was propounded, what is to be thought in general of reading books, whatever sort they be, and whether be more the benefit or the harm that thence proceeds.

Not to insist upon the examples of Moses, Daniel, and Paul, who were skilful in all the learning of the Egyptians, Chaldeans, and Greeks, which could not probably be without reading their books of all sorts, in Paul especially, who thought it no defilement to insert into holy scripture the sentences of three Greek poets, and one of them a tragedian; the question was notwithstanding, sometimes controverted among the primitive doctors, but with great odds on that side which affirmed it both lawful and profitable, as was then evidently perceived, when Julian the Apostate, and subtlest enemy to our faith, made a decree, forbidding Christians the study of heathen learning: for, said he, they wound us with our own weapons, and with our own arts and sciences they overcome us. And indeed the Christians were put so to their shifts by this crafty means, and so much in danger to decline into all ignorance, that the two Apollinarii were fain, as a man may say, to coin all the seven liberal sciences out of the bible, reducing it into divers forms of orations, poems, dialogues, even to the calculating of a new christian grammar. But, saith the historian Socrates, the providence of God provided better than the industry of Apollinarius and his son, by taking away that illiterate law with the life of him who devised it. So great an injury they then held it to be deprived of Hellenic learning; and thought it a persecution more undermining, and secretly decaying the church, than the open cruelty of

Decius or Dioclesian. And perhaps it was the same politic drift that the devil whipt St. Jerome in a lenten dream, for reading Cicero; or else it was a phantasm, bred by the fever which had then seized him. For had an angel been his discipliner, unless it were for dwelling too much on Ciceronianisms, and had chastized the reading, not the vanity, it had been plainly partial; first to correct him for grave Cicero, and not for scurril Plautus, whom he confesses to have been reading not long before; next to correct him only, and let so many more ancient fathers wax old in those pleasant and florid studies without the lash of such a tutoring apparition; insomuch that Basil teaches how some good use may be made of Margites a sportful poem, not now extant, writ by Homer; and why not then of Morgante an Italian romance much to the same purpose? But if it be agreed, we shall be try'd by visions, there is a vision recorded by Eusebius, far ancients than this tale of Jerom, to the nun Eustochium, and besides, has nothing of a fever in it. Dionysius Alexandrinus was, about the year 240, a person of great name in the church, for piety and learning, who had wont to avail himself much against heretics, by being conversant in their books; until a certain presbyter laid it scrupulously to his conscience, how he durst venture himself among those defiling volumes. The worthy man, loth to give offence, fell into a new debate with himself, what was to be thought; when suddenly a vision sent from God, (it is his own epistle that so avers it,) confirmed him in these words: "Read any books whatever come to thy hands, for thou art sufficient both to judge aright, and to examine each matter." To this revelation he assented the sooner, as he confesses, because it was answerable to that of the apostle to the Thessalonians; "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." And he might have added another remarkable saying of the same author: "To the pure, all things are pure;" not only meats and drinks, but all kind of knowledge, whether of good or evil: the knowledge cannot defile, nor consequently the books, if the will and conscience be not defiled. For books are as meats and viands are; some of good, some of evil substance; and yet God in that unapocryphal vision, said without exception, "Rise Peter, kill and eat;" leaving the choice to each man's discretion. Wholesome meats to a vitiated stomach, differ little or nothing from unwholesome; and best books to a naughty mind are not unapplicable to occasions of evil. Bad meats will scarce breed good nourishment in the healthiest concoction; but herein the difference is of bad books, that they to a discreet and judicious reader serve in many respects to discover, to confute, to forewarn, and to illustrate. Whereof what better witness can ye expect I should produce, than one of your own now sitting in parliament, the chief of learned men reputed in this land, Mr. Selden; whose volume of natural and national laws proves, not only by great authorities brought together, but by exquisite reasons and theorems almost mathematically demonstrative, that all opinions, yea errors, known, read and collated, are of main service and assistance toward the speedy attainment of what is truest. I conceive therefore, that when God did enlarge the universal diet of man's body (saving ever the rules of temperance,) he then also, as before, left arbitrary the dieting and repasting of our minds; as wherein every mature man might have to exercise his own leading capacity. How great a virtue is temperance, how much of moment thro' the whole life of man? yet God commits the managing so great a trust without particular law or prescription, wholly to the demeanor of every grown man. And therefore when he himself tabled the Jews from heaven, that Omer which was every man's daily portion of manna, is computed to have been more than might have well sufficed the heartiest feeder thrice as many meals. For those actions which enter into a man, rather than issue out of him, and therefore defile not, God uses not to captivate under a perpetual childhood of prescription, but trusts him with the gift of reason to be his own chuser: there were but little work left for preaching, if law and compulsion should grow so fast upon those things which heretofore were governed only by exhortation. Solomon informs us, that much reading is a weariness to the flesh; but neither he, nor other inspired author tells us that such, or such reading is unlawful: yet certainly had God thought good to

limit us herein, it had been much more expedient to have told us what was unlawful, than what was wearisome. As for the burning of those Ephesian books by St. Paul's converts; 'tis reply'd, the books were magic, the Syriac so renders them. It was a private act, a voluntary act, and leaves us to a voluntary imitation: the men in remorse burnt those books which were their own; the magistrate by this example is not appointed: these men practised the books, another might perhaps have read them in some sort usefully. Good and evil we know in the field of this world grow up together almost inseparably: and the knowledge of good is so involved and interwoven with the knowledge of evil, and in so many cunning resemblances hardly to be discerned, that those confused seeds which were imposed upon Psyche as an incessant labour to cull out, and sort asunder, were not more intermixed. It was from out the rind of one apple tasted, that the knowledge of good and evil, as two twins cleaving together, leaped forth into the world. And perhaps this is that doom which Adam fell into of knowing good and evil, that is to say, of knowing good by evil. As therefore the state of man now is; what wisdom can there be to chuse, what continence to forbear without the knowledge of evil? He that can apprehend and consider vice with all her baits and seeming pleasures, and yet abstain, and yet distinguish, and yet prefer that which is truly better, he is the true war-faring Christian. I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies out and sees her adversary, but flinks out of the race, where that immortal garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat. Assuredly we bring not innocence into the world, we bring impurity much rather: that which purifies us is trial, and trial is by what is contrary. That virtue therefore which is but a youngling in the contemplation of evil, and knows not the utmost that vice promises to her followers, and rejects it, is but a blank virtue, not a pure; her whiteness is but an excremental whiteness: which was the reason why our sage and serious poet Spenser, (whom I dare be known to think a better teacher than Scotus or Aquinas,) describing true temperance under the person of Guion, brings him in with his palmer through the cave of Mammon, and the bower of earthly bliss, that he might see and know, and yet abstain. Since therefore the knowledge and survey of vice is in this world so necessary to the constituting of human virtue, and the scanning of error to the confirmation of truth, how can we more safely, and with less danger scout into the regions of sin and falsity, than by reading all manner of tractates, and hearing all manner of reason? And this is the benefit which may be had of books promiscuously read. But of the harm that may result hence, three kinds are usually reckoned. First, is feared the infection that may spread; but then all human learning and controversy in religious points, must remove out of the world, yea, the bible itself; for that oft-times relates blasphemy not nicely, it describes the carnal sense of wicked men not unelegantly, it brings in holiest men passionately murmuring against providence through all the arguments of Epicurus; in other great disputes it answers dubiously and darkly to the common reader: and ask a Talmudist what ails the modesty of his marginal Keri, that Moses and all the prophets cannot persuade him to pronounce the textual Chetiv. For these causes we all know the Bible itself put by the papist into the first rank of prohibited books. The ancientest fathers must be next removed, as Clement of Alexandria, and that Eusebian book of evangelic preparation, transmitting our ears through a hoard of heathenish obscenities to receive the gospel. Who finds not that Irenæus, Epiphanius, Jerome, and others discover more heresies than they well confute, and that oft for heresy which is the truer opinion? Nor boots it to say for these, and all the heathen writers of greatest infection, if it must be thought so, with whom is bound up the life of human learning, that they writ in an unknown tongue, so long as we are sure those languages are known as well to the worst of men, who are both most able, and most diligent to instil the poison they suck, first into the courts of princes, acquainting them with the choicest delights, and criticisms of sin. As perhaps did that Petronius, whom Nero called his Arbiter, the master of his revels; and that notorious ribald of Arezzo, dreaded, and yet dear to the Italian

Italian courtiers. I name not him for posterity's sake, whom Henry the 8th named in merriment his vicar of hell. By which compendious way all the contagion that foreign books can infuse, will find a passage to the people far easier and shorter than an Indian voyage, tho' it could be sail'd either by the north of Cataio eastward, or of Canada westward, while our Spanish licensing gags the English press never so severely. But on the other side, that infection which is from books of controversy in religion, is more doubtful and dangerous to the learned, than to the ignorant; and yet those books must be permitted untouch'd by the licenser. It will be hard to instance where any ignorant man hath been ever seduced by any papistical book in English, unless it were commended and expounded to him by some of that clergy: and indeed all such tractates, whether false or true, are as the prophecy of Isaiah was to the Eunuch, not to be "understood without a guide." But of our priests and doctors, how many have been corrupted by studying the comments of Jesuits and Sorbonists, and how fast they could transfuse that corruption into the people, our experience is both late and sad. It is not forgot, since the acute and distinct Arminius was perverted merely by the perusing of a nameless discourse written at Delft, which at first he took in hand to confute. Seeing therefore that those books, and those in great abundance which are likeliest to taint both life and doctrine, cannot be suppress'd without the fall of learning, and of all ability in disputation, and that these books of either sort are most and soonest catching to the learned, (from whom to the common people whatever is heretical or dissolute, may quickly be conveyed,) and that evil manners are as perfectly learnt without books a thousand other ways which cannot be stopt, and evil doctrine not with books can propagate, except a teacher guide, which he might also do without writing, and so beyond prohibiting; I am not able to unfold, how this cautelous enterprize of licensing can be exempted from the number of vain and impossible attempts. And he who were pleasantly disposed, could not well avoid to liken it to the exploit of that gallant man, who thought to pound up the crows by shutting his park-gate. Besides another inconvenience, if learned men be the first receivers out of books, and dispreaders both of vice and error, how shall the licensers themselves be confided in, unless we can confer upon them, or they assume to themselves above all others in the land, the grace of infallibility, and uncorruptedness? And again, if it be true, that a wise man, like a good refiner, can gather gold out of the drossiest volume, and that a fool will be a fool with the best book, yea, or without book; there is no reason that we should deprive a wise man of any advantage to his wisdom, while we seek to restrain from a fool, that which being restrained will be no hindrance to his folly. For if there should be so much exactness always used to keep that from him which is unfit for his reading, we should in the judgment of Aristotle not only, but of Solomon, and of our Saviour, not vouchsafe him good precepts, and by consequence not willingly admit him to good books; as being certain that a wise man will make better use of an idle pamphlet, than a fool will do of sacred Scripture.

'Tis next alledg'd, we must not expose ourselves to temptations without necessity, and next to that, not employ our time in vain things. To both these objections one answer will serve, out of the grounds already laid, that to all men such books are not temptations, nor vanities; but useful drugs and materials wherewith to temper and compose effective and strong medicines, which man's life cannot want. The rest, as children and childish men, who have not the art to qualify and prepare these working minerals, well may be exhorted to forbear, but hinder'd forcibly they cannot be, by all the licensing that sainted inquisition could ever yet contrive; which is what I promised to deliver next: That this order of licensing conduces nothing to the end for which it was fram'd; and hath almost prevented me by being clear already while thus much hath been explaining. See the ingenuity of truth, who when she gets a free and willing hand, opens herself faster than the pace of method and discourse can overtake her. It was the task which I began with, to shew that no nation, or well-instituted state, if they valu'd books at all, did ever use

this way of licensing; and it might be answer'd, that this is a piece of prudence lately discover'd. To which I return, that as it was a thing slight and obvious to think on, so if it had been difficult to find out, there wanted not among them long since, who suggested such a course; which they not following, leave us a pattern of their judgment, that it was not the not knowing, but the not approving, which was the cause of their not using it. Plato, a man of high authority indeed, but least of all for his commonwealth, in the book of his laws, which no city ever yet receiv'd, fed his fancy with making many edicts to his airy burgomasters, which they who otherwise admire him, wish had been rather buried and excus'd in the genial cups of an Academic night-sitting. By which laws he seems to tolerate no kind of learning, but by unalterable decree, consisting most of practical traditions, to the attainment whereof a library of smaller bulk than his own dialogues would be abundant. And there also enacts, that no poet should so much as read to any private man what he had written, until the judges and law-keepers had seen it, and allow'd it: But that Plato meant this law peculiarly to that commonwealth which he had imagin'd, and to no other, is evident. Why was he not else a law-giver to himself, but a transgressor, and to be expell'd by his own magistrates, both for the wanton epigrams and dialogues which he made, and his perpetual reading of Sophron, Mimus, and Aristophanes, books of grossest infamy; and also for commending the latter of them, though he were the malicious libeller of his chief friends, to be read by the tyrant Dionysius, who had little need of such trash to spend his time on? But that he knew this licensing of poems had reference and dependance to many other proviso's there set down in his fancied republic, which in this world could have no place: and so neither he himself, nor any magistrate or city ever imitated that course, which taken apart from those other collateral injunctions, must needs be vain and fruitless. For if they fell upon one kind of strictness unless their care were equal to regulate all other things of like aptness to corrupt the mind, that single endeavour they knew would be but a fond labour; to shut and fortify one gate against corruption, and be necessitated to leave others round about wide open. If we think to regulate printing, thereby to rectify manners, we must regulate all recreations and pastimes, all that is delightful to man. No music must be heard, no song be set or sung, but what is grave and Doric. There must be licensing dancers, that no gesture, motion, or deportment be taught our youth, but what by their allowance shall be thought honest; for such Plato was provided of: It will ask more than the work of twenty licensers to examine all the lutes, the violins, and the ghitaras in every house; they must not be suffer'd to prattle as they do, but must be licens'd what they may say. And who shall silence all the airs and madrigals that whisper softness in chambers? The windows also, and the balconies must be thought on; there are shrewd books, with dangerous frontispieces, set to sale; who shall prohibit them, shall twenty licensers? The villages also must have their visitors to enquire what lectures the bagpipe, and the rebbec reads, even to the ballatry and the gammuth of every municipal fidler; for these are the countryman's Arcadia's, and his Monte Mayors. Next, what more national corruption, for which England hears ill abroad, than household gluttony; who shall be the rectors of our daily rioting? and what shall be done to inhibit the multitudes that frequent those houses where drunkenness is sold and harboured? Our garments also should be referr'd to the licensing of some more sober work-masters, to see them cut into a less wanton garb. Who shall regulate all the mixed conversation of our youth, male and female together, as is the fashion of this country? Who shall still appoint what shall be discoursed, what presumed, and no further? Lastly, who shall forbid and separate all idle resort, all evil company? These things will be, and must be; but how they shall be least hurtful, how least enticing, herein consists the grave and governing wisdom of a state. To sequester out of the world into Atlantic and Eutopian polities, which never can be drawn into use, will not mend our condition; but to ordain wisely as in this world of evil, in the midst whereof God hath placed us unavoidably. Nor is it Plato's licensing of
books

books will do this, which necessarily pulls along with it so many other kinds of licensing, as will make us all both ridiculous and weary, and yet frustrate; but those unwritten, or at least unconstraining laws of virtuous education, religious and civil nurture, which Plato there mentions, as the bonds and ligaments of the commonwealth, the pillars and the sustainers of every written statute; these they be which will bear chief sway in such matters as these, when all licensing will be easily eluded. Impunity and remissness for certain are the bane of a commonwealth; but here the great art lies, to discern in what the law is to bid restraint and punishment, and in what things persuasion only is to work. If every action which is good or evil in man at ripe years, were to be under pittance and prescription, and compulsion, what were virtue but a name, what praise could be then due to well-doing, what grammarcy to be sober, just or continent? Many there be that complain of divine providence for suffering Adam to transgress. Foolish tongues! when God gave him reason, he gave him freedom to chuse, for reason is but chusing; he had been else a mere artificial Adam, such an Adam as he is in the motions. We ourselves esteem not of that obedience, or love, or gift, which is of force: God therefore left him free, set before him a provoking object, ever almost in his eyes; herein consisted his merit, herein the right of his reward, the praise of his abstinence. Wherefore did he create passions within us, pleasures round about us, but that these rightly tempered are the very ingredients of virtue? They are not skilful considerers of human things, who imagine to remove sin by removing the matter of sin; for, besides that it is a huge heap increasing under the very act of diminishing, though some part of it may for a time be withdrawn from some persons, it cannot from all, in such a universal thing as books are; and when this is done, yet the sin remains entire. Though ye take from a covetous man all his treasure, he has yet one jewel left, ye cannot bereave him of his covetousness. Banish all objects of lust, shut up all youth into the severest discipline that can be exercis'd in any hermitage, ye cannot make them chaste, that came not thither so: such great care and wisdom is required to the right managing of this point. Suppose we could expel sin by this means; look how much we thus expel of sin, so much we expel of virtue: for the matter of them both is the same; remove that, and ye remove them both alike. This justifies the high providence of God, who though he commands us temperance, justice, continence, yet pours out before us even to a profuseness all desirable things, and gives us minds that can wander beyond all limit and satiety. Why should we then affect a rigour contrary to the manner of God and of nature, by abridging or scanting those means, which books, freely permitted, are, both to the trial of virtue, and the exercise of truth? It would be better done to learn that the law must needs be frivolous which goes to restrain things, uncertainly and yet equally working to good, and to evil. And were I the chuser, a dram of well-doing should be preferred before many times as much the forcible hindrance of evil-doing. For God sure esteems the growth and completing of one virtuous person, more than the restraint of ten vitious. And albeit, whatever thing we hear or see, sitting, walking, travelling, or conversing, may be fitly called our book, and is of the same effect that writings are; yet grant the thing to be prohibited were only books, it appears that this order hitherto is far insufficient to the end which it intends. Do we not see, not once or oftener, but weekly, that continued court-libel against the parliament and city, printed, as the wet sheets can witness, and dispers'd among us, for all that licensing can do? Yet this is the prime service a man would think, wherein this order should give proof of itself. If it were executed, you'll say. But certain, if execution be remis or blind-fold now, and in this particular, what will it be hereafter, and in other books? If then the order shall not be vain and frustrate, behold a new labour, lords and commons, ye must repeal and proscribe all scandalous and unlicensed books already printed and divulg'd; after ye have drawn them up into a list, that all may know which are condemned, and which not; and ordain that no foreign books be delivered out of custody, till they have been read over. This office will require

quire the whole time of not a few overseers, and those no vulgar men. There be also books which are partly useful and excellent, partly culpable and pernicious; this work will ask as many more officials, to make expurgations and expunctions, that the commonwealth of learning be not damnify'd. In fine, when the multitude of books encrease upon their hands, ye must be fain to catalogue all those printers who are found frequently offending, and forbid the importation of their whole suspected Typography. In a word, that this your order may be exact, and not deficient, ye must reform it perfectly according to the model of Trent and Sevil, which I know ye abhor to do. Yet though ye should condescend to this, which God forbid, the order still would be but fruitless and defective to that end whereto ye meant it. If to prevent sects and schisms, who is so unread or uncatechised in story, that hath not heard of many sects refusing books as a hindrance, and preserving their doctrine unmixed for many ages, only by unwritten traditions? The Christian faith, (for that was once a schism!) is not unknown to have spread all over Asia, ere any gospel or epistle was seen in writing. If the amendment of manners be aim'd at, look into Italy and Spain, whether those places be one scruple the better, the honester, the wiser, the chaster, since all the inquisitional rigor that hath been executed upon books.

Another reason, whereby to make it plain that this order will miss the end it seeks, consider by the quality which ought to be in every licenser. It cannot be deny'd but that he who is made judge to sit upon the birth, or death of books, whether they may be waisted into this world, or not, had need to be a man above the common measure, both studious, learned, and judicious; there may be else no mean mistakes in the censure of what is passable or not; which is also no mean injury. If he be of such worth as behoves him, there cannot be a more tedious and unpleasing journey-work, a greater loss of time levied upon his head, than to be made the perpetual reader of unchosen books and pamphlets, oft-times huge volumes. There is no book that is acceptable, unless at certain seasons; but to be enjoined the reading of that at all times, and in a hand scarce legible, whereof three pages would not down at any time in the fairest print, is an imposition which I cannot believe how he that values time, and his own studies, or is but of a sensible nostril, should be able to endure. In this one thing I crave leave of the present licensers to be pardoned for so thinking: who doubtless took this office up, looking on it thro' their obedience to the parliament, whose command perhaps made all things seem easy and unlaborious to them; but that this short trial hath wearied them out already, their own expressions and excuses to them who make so many journies to solicit their licence, are testimony enough. Seeing therefore those who now possess the employment, by all evident signs with themselves well rid of it, and that no man of worth, none that is not a plain unthrift of his own hours, is ever likely to succeed them, except he mean to put himself to the salary of a press-corrector, we may easily foresee what kind of licensers we are to expect hereafter, either ignorant, imperious, and remiss, or basely pecuniary. This is what I had to shew, wherein this order cannot conduce to that end, whereof it bears the intention.

I lastly proceed from the no good it can do, to the manifest hurt it causes, in being first the greatest discouragement and affront that can be offered to learning, and to learned men. It was the complaint and lamentation of prelates, upon every least breath of a motion to remove pluralities, and distribute more equally Church-revenues, that then all learning would be for ever dashed and discouraged. But as for that opinion, I never found cause to think that the tenth part of learning stood or fell with the clergy: nor could I ever but hold it for a sordid and unworthy speech of any churchman, who had a competency left him. If therefore ye be loth to dishearten utterly and discontent, not the mercenary crew of false pretenders to learning, but the free and ingenuous sort of such as evidently were born to study and love learning for itself, not for lucre, or any other end, but

but the service of God and of truth, and perhaps that lasting fame and perpetuity of praise which God and good men have consented shall be the reward of those whose publish'd labours advance the good of mankind: then know, that so far to distrust the judgment and the honesty of one who hath but a common repute in learning, and never yet offended, as not to count him fit to print his mind without a tutor and examiner, lest he should drop a schism, or something of corruption, is the greatest displeasure and indignity to a free and knowing spirit that can be put upon him. What advantage is it to be a man, over it is to be a boy at school, if we have only escaped the ferular, to come under the fescue of an Imprimatur? If serious and elaborate writings, as if they were no more than the theme of a grammar-lad under his pedagogue, must not be utter'd without the cursory eyes of a temporizing and extemporizing licenser? He who is not trusted with his own actions, his drift not being known to be evil, and standing to the hazard of law and penalty, has no great argument to think himself reputed in the commonwealth wherein he was born, for other than a fool or a foreigner. When a man writes to the world, he summons up all his reason and deliberation to assist him; he searches, meditates, is industrious, and likely consults and confers with his judicious friends; after all which done, he takes himself to be informed in what he writes, as well as any that writ before him; if in this the most consummate act of his fidelity and ripeness, no years, no industry, no former proof of his abilities can bring him to that state of maturity, as not to be still mistrusted and suspected, unless he carry all his considerate diligence, all his midnight watchings, and expence of Palladian oil, to the hasty view of an unleisured licenser, perhaps much his younger, perhaps far his inferior in judgment, perhaps one who never knew the labour of book-writing; and if he be not repuls'd, or flighted, must appear in print like a puny with his guardian, and his censor's hand on the back of his title to be his bail and surety, that he is no idiot, or seducer; it cannot be but a dishonour and derogation to the author, to the book, to the privilege and dignity of learning. And what if the author shall be one so copious of fancy, as to have many things well worth the adding, come into his mind after licensing, while the book is yet under the press, which not seldom happens to the best and diligentest writers; and that perhaps a dozen times in one book. The printer dares not go beyond his licens'd copy; so often then must the author trudge to his leave-giver, that those his new insertions may be view'd; and many a jaunt will be made, ere that licenser, for it must be the same man, can either be found, or found at leisure; mean while either the press must stand still, which is no small damage, or the author lose his accuratest thoughts, and send the book forth worse than he had made it, which to a diligent writer is the greatest melancholy and vexation that can befall. And how can a man teach with authority, which is the life of teaching; how can he be a doctor in his book as he ought to be, or else had better be silent, whenas all he teaches, all he delivers, is but under the tuition, under the correction of his patriarchial licenser, to blot or alter what precisely accords not with the hide-bound humour which he calls his judgment? When every acute reader upon the first sight of a pedantic licence, will be ready with these like words to ding the book a coit's distance from him, I hate a pupil teacher, I endure not an instructor that comes to me under the wardship of an overseeing fist. I know nothing of the licenser, but that I have his own hand here for his arrogance; who shall warrant me his judgment? The state, Sir, replies the stationer: but has a quick return, the state shall be my governors, but not my critics; they may be mistaken in the choice of a licenser, as easily as this licenser may be mistaken in an author. This is some common stuff; and he might add from Sir Francis Bacon, that "such authorized books are but the language of the times." For though a licenser should happen to be judicious more than ordinary, which will be a great jeopardy of the next succession, yet his very office, and his commission enjoins him to let pass nothing but what is vulgarly receiv'd already. Nay, which is more lamentable, if the work of any deceased author, though never so famous in his life-time, and even to this day, comes

to their hands for licence to be printed, or reprinted, if there be found in his book, one sentence of a ventrous edge, uttered in the height of zeal, (and who knows whether it might not be the dictate of a divine spirit?) yet not suiting with every low decrepit humour of their own, though it were Knox himself, the reformer of a kingdom that spake it, they will not pardon him their dash: the sense of that great man shall to all posterity be lost, for the fearfulness, or the presumptuous rashness of a perfunctory licenser. And to what an author this violence hath been lately done, and in what book of greatest consequence to be faithfully published, I could now instance, but shall forbear till a more convenient season. Yet if these things be not resented seriously and timely by them who have the remedy in their power, but that such iron-molds as these shall have authority to gnaw out the choicest periods of exquisite books, and to commit such a treacherous fraud against the orphan remainders of worthiest men after death, the more sorrow will belong to that hapless race of men, whose misfortune it is to have understanding. Henceforth let no man care to learn, or care to be more than worldly wise; for certainly in higher matters to be ignorant and slothful, to be a common steadfast dunce, will be the only pleasant life, and only in request.

And as it is a particular disesteem of every knowing person alive, and most injurious to the written labours and monuments of the dead, so to me it seems an undervaluing and vilifying of the whole nation. I cannot set so light by all the invention, the art, the wit, the grave and solid judgment which is in England, as that it can be comprehended in any twenty capacities how good soever; much less that it should not pass except their superintendence be over it, except it be sifted and strained with their strainers, that it should be uncurrent without their manual stamp. Truth and understanding are not such wares as to be monopolized and traded in by tickets, and statutes, and standards. We must not think to make a staple commodity of all the knowledge in the land, to mark and license it like our broad-cloth, and our wool-packs. What is it but a servitude like that imposed by the Philistines, not to be allowed the sharpening of our own axes and coulters, but we must repair from all quarters to twenty licensing forges? Had any one written and divulged erroneous things and scandalous to honest life, misusing and forfeiting the esteem had of his reason among men, if after conviction this only censure were adjudged him, that he should never henceforth write, but what were first examined by an appointed officer, whose hand should be annexed to pass his credit for him, that now he might be safely read; it could not be apprehended less than a disgraceful punishment. Whence to include the whole nation, and those that never yet thus offended, under such a diffident and suspectful prohibition, may plainly be understood what a disparagement it is. So much the more whenas debtors and delinquents may walk abroad without a keeper, but unoffensive books must not stir forth without a visible jaylor in their title. Nor is it to the common people less than a reproach; for if we be so jealous over them, as that we dare not trust them with an English pamphlet, what do we but censure them for a giddy, vicious, and ungrounded people; in such a sick and weak estate of faith and discretion, as to be able to take nothing down but through the pipe of a licenser? That this is care or love of them, we cannot pretend, whenas in those Popish places where the laity are most hated and despised, the same strictness is used over them. Wisdom we cannot call it, because it stops but one breach of licence, nor that neither: whenas those corruptions which it seeks to prevent, break in faster at other doors which cannot be shut.

And in conclusion it reflects to the disrepute of our ministers also, of whose labours we should hope better, and of their proficiency which their flock reaps by them, than that after all this light of the gospel which is, and is to be, and all this continual preaching, they should be still frequented with such an unprincipled, unedified, and laic rabble, as that the whiff of every new pamphlet should stagger them out of their catechism, and christian walking. This may have much reason to discourage the ministers, when such

a low conceit is had of all their exhortations, and the benefiting of their hearers, as that they are not thought fit to be turned loose to three sheets of paper without a licenser; that all the sermons, all the lectures preached, printed, vended in such numbers, and such volumes, as have now well-nigh made all other books unsaleable, should not be armour enough against one single Enchiridion, without the castle St. Angelo of an Imprimatur.

And lest some should persuade ye, Lords and Commons, that these arguments of learned men's discouragement at this your order, are meer flourishes, and not real, I could recount what I have seen and heard in other countries, where this kind of inquisition tyrannizes; when I have sat among their learned men, (for that honour I had,) and been counted happy to be born in such a place of philosophic freedom, as they supposed England was, while themselves did nothing but bemoan the servile condition into which learning amongst them was brought; that this was it which had damp't the glory of Italian wits; that nothing had been there written now these many years but flattery and fustian. There it was that I found, and visited the famous Galileo grown old, a prisoner to the inquisition, for thinking in astronomy otherwise than the Franciscan and Dominican licensers thought. And though I knew that England then was groaning loudest under the prelatical yolk, nevertheless I took it as a pledge of future happiness, that other nations were so persuaded of her liberty. Yet was it beyond my hope, that those worthies were then breathing in her air, who should be her leaders to such a deliverance, as shall never be forgotten by any revolution of time that this world hath to finish. When that was once begun, it was as little in my fear, that what words of complaint I heard among learned men of other parts uttered against the inquisition, the same I should hear by as learned men at home uttered in time of parliament against an order of licensing; and that so generally, that when I had disclosed myself a companion of their discontent, I might say, if without envy, that he whom an honest Quæstorship had endeared to the Sicilians, was not more by them importuned against Verres, than the favourable opinion which I had among many who honour ye, and are known and respected by ye, loaded me with entreaties and persuasions, that I would not despair to lay together that which just reason should bring into my mind, toward the removal of an undeserved thralldom upon learning. That this is not therefore the disburdening of a particular fancy, but the common grievance of all those who had prepared their minds and studies above the vulgar pitch to advance truth in others, and from others to entertain it, thus much may satisfy. And in their name I shall for neither friend nor foe conceal what the general murmur is; that if it come to inquisitioning again, and licensing, and that we are so timorous of ourselves, and suspicious of all men, as to fear each book, and the shaking of every leaf, before we know what the contents are; if some who but of late were little better than silenced from preaching, shall come now to silence us from reading, except what they please, it cannot be guess't what is intended by some but a second tyranny over learning: and will soon put it out of controversy that bishops and presbyters are the same to us both name and thing. That those evils of prelaty which before from five or six and twenty fees were distributively charged upon the whole people, will now light wholly upon learning, is not obscure to us: whenas now the pastor of a small unlearned parish, on the sudden shall be exalted archbishop over a large diocese of books, and yet not remove, but keep his other cure too, a mystical pluralist. He who but of late cry'd down the sole ordination of every novice batchelor of art, and deny'd sole jurisdiction over the simplest parishioner, shall now at home in his private chair assume both these over worthiest and excellentest books, and ablest authors that write them. This is not, ye covenants and protestations that we have made! this is not to put down prelaty; this is but to chop an episcopacy; this is but to translate the palace Metropolitane from one kind of dominion into another; this is but an old canonical flight of commuting our penance. To startle thus betimes at a meer

unlicens'd pamphlet, will, after a while, be afraid of every conventicle, and a while after will make a conventicle of every christian meeting. But I am certain that a state govern'd by the rules of justice and fortitude, or a church built and founded upon the rock of faith and true knowledge, cannot be so pusillanimous. While things are yet not constituted in religion, that freedom of writing should be restrain'd by a discipline imitated from the prelates, and learnt by them from the inquisition to shut us up all again into the breast of a licenser, must needs give cause of doubt and discouragement to all learned and religious men: Who cannot but discern the fineness of this politic drift, and who are the contrivers; that while bishops were to be baited down, then all presses might be open; it was the people's birth-right and privilege in time of parliament, it was the breaking forth of light. But now the bishops abrogated and voided out of the church, as if our reformation sought no more, but to make room for others into their seats under another name; the episcopal arts begin to bud again; the cruise of truth must run no more oil; liberty of printing must be enthralled again under a prelatial commission of twenty; the privilege of the people nullified; and which is worse, the freedom of learning must groan again, and to her old fetters: all this the parliament yet sitting. Although their own late arguments and defences against the prelates might remember them that this obstructing violence meets for the most part with an event utterly opposite to the end which it drives at: instead of suppressing sects and schisms, it raises them and invests them with a reputation: "The punishing of wits enhances their authority," saith the viscount St. Albans; "and a forbidden writing is thought to be a certain spark of truth that flies up in the faces of them who seek to tread it out." This order therefore may prove a nursing mother to sects, but I shall easily shew how it will be a step-dame to truth: and first by disabbling us to the maintenance of what is known already.

Well knows he who uses to consider, that our faith and knowledge thrives by exercise, as well as our limbs and complexion. Truth is compared in scripture to a streaming Fountain; if her waters flow not in a perpetual progression, they sicken into a muddy pool of conformity and tradition. A man may be a heretic in the truth; and if he believe things only because his pastor says so, or the assembly so determines, without knowing other reason, though his belief be true, yet the very truth he holds, becomes his heresy. There is not any burden that some would gladlier post off to another, than the charge and care of their religion. There be, who knows not that there be of protestants and professors who live and die in as errant an implicit faith, as any lay-papist of Loretto. A wealthy man, addicted to his pleasure and to his profits, finds religion to be a traffic so entangled, and of so many piddling accounts, that of all mysteries he cannot skill to keep a stock going upon that trade. What should he do? fain he would have the name to be religious, fain he would bear up with his neighbours in that. What does he therefore, but resolves to give over toiling, and to find himself out some factor, to whose care and credit he may commit the whole managing of his religious affairs; some divine of note and estimation that must be. To him he adheres, resigns the whole warehouse of his religion, with all the locks and keys into his custody; and indeed makes the very person of that man his religion; esteems his associating with him a sufficient evidence and commendatory of his own piety. So that a man may say his religion is now no more within himself, but is become a dividual moveable, and goes and comes near him, according as that good man frequents the house. He entertains him, gives him gifts, feasts him, lodges him; his religion comes home at night, prays, is liberally supped, and sumptuously laid to sleep; rises, is saluted, and after the malmsey, or some well-spiced bruage, and better breakfasted, than he whose morning appetite would have gladly fed on green figs between Bethany and Jerusalem; his religion walks abroad at eight, and leaves his kind entertainer in the shop trading all day without his religion.

Another sort there be, who when they hear that all things shall be ordered, all things regulated and settled; nothing written but what passes through the custom-house of certain publicans that have the tonnage and poundage of all free spoken truth; will straight give themselves up into your hands, make them and cut them out what religion ye please: there be delights, there be recreations and jolly pastimes that will fetch the day about from sun to sun, and rock the tedious year as in a delightful dream. What need they torture their heads with that which others have taken so strictly, and so unalterably into their own purveying? These are the fruits which a dull ease and cessation of our knowledge will bring forth among the people. How goodly, and how to be wished were such an obedient unanimity as this? what a fine conformity would it stretch us all into? doubtless a staunch and solid piece of frame-work, as any January could freeze together.

Nor much better will be the consequence even among the clergy themselves: it is no new thing never heard of before, for a parochial minister, who has his reward, and is at his Hercules Pillars in a warm benefice, to be easily inclinable, if he have nothing else that may rouse up his studies, to finish his circuit in an English concordance and a topic Folio, the gatherings and savings of a sober graduateship, a Harmony and a Catena, treading the constant round of certain common doctrinal heads, attended with their uses, motives, marks and means; out of which, as out of an alphabet or Sol fa, by forming and transforming, joining and dis-joining variously a little bookcraft, and two hours meditation, might furnish him unspeakably to the performance of more than a weekly charge of sermoning: not to reckon up the infinite helps of interlinaries, breviaries, synopses, and other loitering gear. But as for the multitude of sermons ready printed and piled up, on every text that is not difficult, our London trading St. Thomas in his vestry, and add to boot St. Martin and St. Hugh, have not within their hallow'd limits more vendible ware of all sorts ready made: so that penury he never need fear of pulpit-provision, having where so plentifully to refresh his magazine. But if his rear and flanks be not impaled, if his back-door be not secured by the rigid licenser, but that a bold book may now and then issue forth, and give the assault to some of his old collections in their trenches, it will concern him then to keep waking, to stand in watch, to set good guards and sentinels about his received opinions, to walk the round and counter-round with his fellow-inspectors, fearing lest any of his flock be seduced, who also then would be better instructed, better exercised and disciplined. And God send that the fear of this diligence which must then be used, do not make us affect the laziness of a licensing church!

For if we be sure we are in the right, and do not hold the truth guiltily, which becomes not, if we ourselves condemn not our own weak and frivolous teaching, and the people for an untaught and irreligious gadding rout; what can be more fair, than when a man judicious, learned, and of a conscience, for aught we know, as good as theirs that taught us what we know, shall not privily from house to house, which is more dangerous, but openly by writing publish to the world what his opinion is, what his reasons, and wherefore that which is now thought cannot be found? Christ urged it as wherewith to justify himself that he preached in public; yet writing is more public than preaching; and more easy to refutation, if need be, there being so many whose business and profession merely it is to be the champions of truth; which if they neglect, what can be imputed but their sloth or inability?

Thus much we are hindered and dis-inured by this course of licensing toward the true knowledge of what we seem to know. For how much it hurts and hinders the licensers themselves in the calling of their ministry, more than any secular employment, if they will discharge that office as they ought, so that of necessity they must neglect either the one duty or the other; I insist not, because it is a particular, but leave it to their own conscience, how they will decide it there.

There

There is yet behind of what I purposed to lay open, the incredible loss and detriment that this plot of licensing puts us to, more than if some enemy at sea should stop up all our havens, and ports, and creeks; it hinders and retards the importation of our richest merchandize, truth: nay, it was first established and put in practice by antichristian malice and mystery on set purpose to extinguish, if it were possible, the light of reformation, and to settle falsehood; little differing from that policy wherewith the Turk upholds his Alcoran, by the prohibiting of printing. 'Tis not denied, but gladly confessed, we are to send our thanks and vows to heaven, louder than most of nations, for that great measure of truth which we enjoy, especially in those main points between us and the pope, with his appertinences the prelates: but he who thinks we are to pitch our tent here, and have attained the utmost prospect of reformation, that the mortal glass wherein we contemplate can shew us, till we come to beatific vision; that man by this very opinion declares, that he is yet far short of truth.

Truth indeed came once into the world with her divine master, and was a perfect shape most glorious to look on: but when he ascended, and his apostles after him were laid asleep, then strait arose a wicked race of deceivers, who as that story goes of the Egyptian Typhon with his conspirators, how they dealt with the good Osiris, took the virgin truth, hewed her lovely form into a thousand pieces, and scattered them to the four winds. From that time ever since, the sad friends of truth, such as durst appear, imitating the careful search that Isis made for the mangled body of Osiris, went up and down gathering up limb by limb still as they could find them. We have not yet found them all, Lords and Commons, nor ever shall do, till her Master's second coming; he shall bring together every joint and member, and shall mould them into an immortal feature of loveliness and perfection. Suffer not these licensing prohibitions to stand at every place of opportunity forbidding and disturbing them that continue seeking, that continue to do our obsequies to the torn body of our martyred saint. We boast our light; but if we look not wisely on the sun itself, it smites us into darkness. Who can discern those planets that are oft combust, and those stars of brightest magnitude that rise and set with the sun, until the opposite motion of their orbs bring them to such a place in the firmament, where they may be seen evening or morning? The light which we have gained, was given us, not to be ever staring on, but by it to discover onward things more remote from our knowledge. It is not the unfrocking of a priest, the unmitring of a bishop, and the removing him from off the presbyterian shoulders, that will make us a happy nation; no, if other things as great in the church, and in the rule of life both œconomical and political be not looked into and reformed, we have looked so long upon the blaze that Zuinglius and Calvin have beacons up to us, that we are stark blind. There be who perpetually complain of schisms and sects, and make it such a calamity, that any man dissents from their maxims. 'Tis their own pride and ignorance which causes the disturbing, who neither will hear with meekness, nor can convince, yet all must be suppressed which is not found in their Syntagma. They are the troublers, they are the dividers of unity, who neglect and permit not others to unite those dissevered pieces which are yet wanting to the body of truth. To be still searching what we know not, by what we know, still closing up truth to truth as we find it, (for all her body is homogeneous, and proportional) this is the golden rule in Theology as well as in arithmetic, and makes up the best harmony in a church; not the forced and outward union of cold, and neutral, and inwardly divided minds.

Lords and Commons of England! consider what nation it is whereof ye are, and whereof ye are the governors: a nation not slow and dull, but of a quick, ingenious, and piercing spirit; acute to invent, subtile and sinewy to discourse, not beneath the reach of any point the highest that human capacity can soar to. Therefore the studies of learning in her deepest sciences have been so ancient, and so eminent among us, that writers of good antiquity, and able judgment, have been persuaded that even the school

of Pythagoras, and the Persian wisdom, took beginning from the old philosophy of this island. And that wise and civil Roman, Julius Agricola, who governed once here for Cæsar, preferred the natural wits of Britain, before the laboured studies of the French. Nor is it for nothing that the grave and frugal Transilvanian sends out yearly from as far as the mountainous borders of Russia, and beyond the Hercynian wilderness, not their youth, but their staid men, to learn our language, and our Theologic arts. Yet that which is above all this, the favour and the love of Heaven, we have great argument to think in a peculiar manner propitious and propending towards us. Why else was this nation chosen before any other, that out of her as out of Sion should be proclaimed and sounded forth the first tidings and trumpet of reformation to all Europe? And had it not been the obstinate perverseness of our prelates against the divine and admirable spirit of Wickliff, to suppress him as a schismatic and innovator, perhaps, neither the Bohemian Huss and Jerom, nor the name of Luther, or of Calvin, had been ever known: the glory of reforming all our neighbours had been completely ours. But now, as our obdurate Clergy have with violence demeaned the matter, we are become hitherto the latest and the backwardest scholars, of whom God offered to have made us the teachers. Now once again by all concurrence of signs, and by the general instinct of holy and devout men, as they daily and solemnly express their thoughts, God is decreeing to begin some new and great period in his church, even to the reforming of reformation itself; what does he then but reveal himself to his servants, and as his manner is, first to his English-men? I say as his manner is, first to us, though we mark not the method of his counsels, and are unworthy. Behold now this vast city; a city of refuge, the mansion-house of liberty, encompassed and surrounded with his protection; the shop of war hath not there more anvils and hammers waking, to fashion out the plates and instruments of armed justice in defence of beleaguer'd truth, than there be pens and heads there, sitting by their studious lamps, musing, searching, revolving new notions and ideas wherewith to present as with their homage and their fealty the approaching reformation: others as fast reading, trying all things, assenting to the force of reason and conviction. What could a man require more from a nation so pliant and so prone to seek after knowledge? What wants there to such a towardly and pregnant soil, but wise and faithful labourers, to make a knowing people, a nation of prophets, of sages, and of worthies? We reckon more than five months yet to harvest; there need not be five weeks, had we but eyes to lift up, the fields are white already. Where there is much desire to learn, there of necessity will be much arguing, much writing, many opinions; for opinion in good men is but knowledge in the making. Under these fantastic terrors of sect and schism, we wrong the earnest and zealous thirst after knowledge and understanding, which God hath stirred up in this city. What some lament of, we rather should rejoice at, should rather praise this pious forwardness among men, to re-assume the ill-deputed care of their religion into their own hands again. A little generous prudence, a little forbearance of one another, and some grain of charity might win all these diligencies to join, and unite into one general and brotherly search after truth; could we but forego this prelatical tradition of crowding free consciences and christian liberties into canons and precepts of men. I doubt not, if some great and worthy stranger should come among us, wise to discern the mould and temper of a people, and how to govern it, observing the high hopes and aims, the diligent alacrity of our extended thoughts and reasonings in the pursuance of truth and freedom, but that he would cry out as Pyrrhus did, admiring the Roman docility and courage; if such were my Epirots, I would not despair the greatest design that could be attempted to make a church or kingdom happy. Yet these are the men cried out against for schismatics and sectaries, as if, while the temple of the Lord was building, some cutting, some squaring the marble, others hewing the cedars, there should be a sort of irrational men who could not consider there must be many schisms and many dissections made in the quarry and in the timber, ere the house of God
can

can be built. And when every stone is laid artfully together, it cannot be united into a continuity, it can but be contiguous in this world: neither can every piece of the building be of one form; nay rather the perfection consists in this, that out of many moderate varieties and brotherly dissimilitudes that are not vastly disproportional, arises the goodly and the graceful symmetry that commends the whole pile and structure. Let us therefore be more considerate builders, more wise in spiritual architecture, when great reformation is expected. For now the time seems come, wherein Moses the great prophet may sit in Heaven rejoicing to see that memorable and glorious wish of his fulfilled, when not only our seventy elders but all the lords's people are become prophets. No marvel then though some men, and some good men too perhaps, but young in goodness, as Joshua then was, envy them. They fret, and out of their own weakness are in agony, lest these divisions and sub-divisions will undo us. The adversary again applauds, and waits the hour; when they have branched themselves out, saith he, small enough into parties and partitions, then will be our time. Fool! he sees not the firm root, out of which we all grow, though into branches; nor will beware until he see our small divided maniples cutting through at every angle of his ill-united and unwieldly brigade. And that we are to hope better of all these supposed sects and schisms, and that we shall not need that solicitude, honest perhaps, though over-timorous, of them that vex in this behalf, but shall laugh in the end at those malicious applauders of our differences, I have these reasons to persuade me.

First, when a city shall be as it were besieged and blocked about, her navigable river infested, inroads and incursions round, defiance and battel oft rumour'd to be marching up even to her walls and suburb trenches; that then the people, or the greater part, more than at other times, wholly taken up with the study of highest and most important matters to be reformed, should be disputing, reasoning, reading, inventing, discoursing, even to a rarity and admiration, things not before discoursed or written of, argues first a singular good will, contentedness and confidence in your prudent foresight, and safe government, lords and commons; and from thence derives itself to a gallant bravery and well-grounded contempt of their enemies, as if there were no small number of as great spirits among us, as his was, who when Rome was nigh besieged by Hanibal, being in the city, bought that piece of ground at no cheap rate, whereon Hanibal himself encamped his own regiment. Next, it is a lively and cheerful presage of our happy success and victory. For as in a body, when the blood is fresh, the spirits pure and vigorous, not only to vital, but to rational faculties, and those in the acutest, and the pertest operations of wit and subtlety, it argues in what good plight and constitution the body is; so when the cheerfulness of the people is so sprightly up, as that it has not only wherewith to guard well its own freedom and safety, but to spare, and to bestow upon the solideest and sublimest points of controversy, and new invention, it betokens us not degenerated, nor drooping to a fatal decay, by casting off the old and wrinkled skin of corruption to outlive these pangs, and wax young again, entering the glorious ways of truth and prosperous virtue, destined to become great and honourable in these latter ages. Methinks I see in my mind a noble and puissant nation rousing her self like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks: methinks I see her as an eagle muing her mighty youth, and kindling her undazled eyes at the full mid-day beam; purging and unscaling her long-abused sight at the fountain it self of heavenly radiance; while the whole noise of timorous and flocking birds with those also that love the twilight, flutter about, amazed at what she means, and in their envious gabble would prognosticate a year of sects and schisms.

What should ye do then, should ye suppress all this flowery crop of knowledge and new light sprung up and yet springing daily in this city? should ye set an Oligarchy of twenty ingrossers over it, to bring a famine upon our minds again, when we shall know nothing but what is measured to us by their bushel? Believe it, lords and commons! they who counsel ye to such a suppressing, do as good as bid ye suppress your selves; and I will soon shew

show how. If it be desired to know the immediate cause of all this free writing and free speaking, there cannot be assigned a truer than your own mild, and free, and humane government; it is the liberty, lords and commons, which your own valorous and happy counsels have purchased us; liberty which is the nurse of all great wits: this is that which hath rarified and enlightened our spirits like the influence of heaven; this is that which hath enfranchised, enlarged and lifted up our apprehensions degrees above themselves. Ye cannot make us now less capable, less knowing, less eagerly pursuing of the truth, unless ye first make yourselves, that made us so, less the lovers, less the founders of our true liberty. We can grow ignorant again, brutish, formal, and slavish, as ye found us; but you then must first become that which ye cannot be, oppressive, arbitrary, and tyrannous, as they were from whom ye have freed us. That our hearts are now more capacious, our thoughts more erected to the search and expectation of greatest and exactest things, is the issue of your own virtue propagated in us; ye cannot suppress that, unless ye reinforce an abrogated and merciless law, that fathers may dispatch at will their own children. And who shall then stick closest to ye, and excite others? not he who takes up arms for coat and conduct, and his four nobles of Dangelst. Although I dispraise not the defence of just immunities, yet love my peace better, if that were all. Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties.

What would be best advised then, if it be found so hurtful and so unequal to suppress opinions for the newness, or the unsuitableness to a customary acceptance, will not be my task to say; I shall only repeat what I have learnt from one of your own honourable number, a right noble and pious lord, who had he not sacrificed his life and fortunes to the church and commonwealth, we had not now missed and bewailed a worthy and undoubted patron of this argument. Ye know him, I am sure; yet I for honour's sake, and may it be eternal to him, shall name him, the Lord Brook. He writing of episcopacy, and by the way treating of sects and schisms, left ye his vote, or rather now the last words of his dying charge, which I know will ever be of dear and honoured regard with ye, so full of meekness and breathing charity, that next to his last testament, who bequeathed love and peace to his disciples, I cannot call to mind where I have read or heard words more mild and peaceful. He there exhorts us to hear with patience and humility those, however they be miscalled, that desire to live purely, in such a use of God's ordinances, as the best guidance of their conscience gives them, and to tolerate them, though in some disconformity to our selves. The book it self will tell us more at large, being published to the world, and dedicated to the parliament by him who both for his life and for his death deserves, that what advice he left, be not laid by without perusal.

And now the time in special is, by privilege to write and speak what may help to the further discussing of matters in agitation. The temple of Janus, with his two controversial faces, might now not unsignificantly be set open. And tho' all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple; who ever knew truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter? Her confuting is the best and surest suppressing. He who hears what praying there is for light and clear knowledge to be sent down among us, would think of other matters to be constituted beyond the discipline of Geneva, framed and fabricked already to our hands. Yet when the new light which we beg for, shines in upon us, there be who envy and oppose, if it come not first in at their casements. What a collusion is this, whenas we are exhorted by the wise man to use diligence, "to seek for wisdom as for hidden treasures" early and late, that another order shall enjoin us, to know nothing but by statute? When a man hath been labouring the hardest labour in the deep mines of knowledge, hath furnished out his findings in all their equipage, drawn forth his reasons as it were a battel ranged, scattered and defeated all objections in his way, calls out his adversary into the plain, offers him the advantage of wind and sun, if he please, only that he may try the matter by dint of argument; for his opponents then to

sculk, to lay ambushments, to keep a narrow bridge of licensing where the challenger should pass, though it be valour enough in soldiership, is but weakness and cowardice in the wars of truth. For who knows not that truth is strong, next to the Almighty; she needs no policies, nor stratagems, nor licensings to make her victorious, those are the shifts and the defences that error uses against her power: give her but room, and do not bind her when she sleeps, for then she speaks not true, as the old Proteus did, who spake oracles only when he was caught and bound, but then rather she turns her self into all shapes, except her own, and perhaps tunes her voice according to the time, as Micaiah did before Ahab, until she be adjured into her own likeness. Yet is it not impossible that she may have more shapes than one? what else is all that rank of things indifferent, wherein truth may be on this side, or on the other, without being unlike her self? What but a vain shadow else is the abolition of "those ordinances, that hand-writing nailed to the cross?" what great purchase is this Christian liberty which Paul so often boasts of? His doctrine is, that he who eats or eats not, regards a day or regards it not, may do either to the Lord. How many other things might be tolerated in peace, and left to conscience, had we but charity, and were it not the chief strong hold of our hypocrisy to be ever judging one another? I fear yet this iron yoke of outward conformity hath left a slavish print upon our necks; the ghost of a linen decency yet haunts us. We stumble, and are impatient at the least dividing of one visible congregation from another, tho' it be not in fundamentals; and thro' our forwardness to suppress, and our backwardness to recover any enthral'd piece of truth out of the gripe of custom, we care not to keep truth separated from truth, which is the fiercest rent and disunion of all. We do not see that while we still affect by all means a rigid external formality, we may as soon fall again into a gross conforming stupidity, a stark and dead congealment of "wood and hay and stubble" forced and frozen together, which is more to the sudden degenerating of a church than many subdichotomies of petty schisms. Not that I can think well of every light separation; or that all in a church is to be expected "gold and silver and precious stones:" it is not possible for man to sever the wheat from the tares, the good fish from the other fry; that must be the angels ministry at the end of mortal things. Yet if all cannot be of one mind, as who looks they should be? this doubtless is more wholesome, more prudent, and more christian, that many be tolerated, rather than all compelled. I mean not tolerated popery, and open superstition, which as it extirpates all religions and civil supremacies, so it self should be extirpate, provided first that all charitable and compassionate means be used to win and regain the weak and the misled: that also which is impious or evil absolutely either against faith or manners, no law can possibly permit, that intends not to unlaw it self: but those neighbouring differences, or rather indifferences, are what I speak of, whether in some point of doctrine or of discipline, which though they may be many, yet need not interrupt the unity of spirit, if we could but find among us the bond of peace. In the mean while, if any one would write, and bring his helpful hand to the slow-moving reformation which we labour under, if truth have spoken to him before others, or but seemed at least to speak, who hath so bejesuited us that we should trouble that man with asking licence to do so worthy a deed; and not consider this, that if it come to prohibiting, there is not ought more likely to be prohibited than truth itself: whose first appearance to our eyes, bleared and dimmed with prejudice and custom, is more unsightly and unplaussible than many errors; even as the person is of many a great man slight and contemptible to see to. And what do they tell us vainly of new opinions, when this very opinion of theirs, that none must be heard but whom they like, is the worst and newest opinion of all others; and is the chief cause why sects and schisms do so much abound, and true knowledge is kept at distance from us; besides yet a greater danger which is in it. For when God shakes a kingdom, with strong and healthful commotions, to a general reforming, it is not untrue that many sectaries and false teachers are then busiest in seducing. But yet more true it is, that God then raises to his own work men of rare abilities,

abilities, and more than common industry, not only to look back and revise what hath been taught heretofore, but to gain further and go on, some new enlightened steps in the discovery of truth. For such is the order of God's enlightening his Church, to dispense and deal out by degrees his beam, so as our earthly eyes may best sustain it. Neither is God appointed and confined, where and out of what place these his chosen shall be first heard to speak; for he sees not as man sees, chooses not as man chooses, lest we should devote ourselves again to set places, and assemblies, and outward callings of men; planting our faith one while in the old convocation-house, and another while in the Chapel at Westminster; when all the faith and religion that shall be there canonized, is not sufficient without plain convincement, and the charity of patient instruction, to supple the least bruise of conscience, to edify the meanest christian, who desires to walk in the spirit, and not in the letter of human trust, for all the number of voices that can be there made; no though Harry the 7th himself there, with all his liege tombs about him, should lend them voices from the dead, to swell their number. And if the men be erroneous who appear to be the leading schismatics, what with-holds us but our sloth, our self-will, and distrust in the right cause, that we do not give them gentle meetings and gentle dismissions, that we debate not and examine the matter thoroughly with liberal and frequent audience; if not for their sakes, yet for our own? seeing no man who hath tasted learning, but will confess the many ways of profiting by those who, not contented with stale receipts, are able to manage and set forth new positions to the world. And were they but as the dust and cinders of our feet, so long as in that notion they may yet serve to polish and brighten the armory of truth, even for that respect they were not utterly to be cast away. But if they be of those whom God hath fitted for the special use of these times with eminent and ample gifts, and those perhaps neither among the priests, nor among the Pharisees, and we in the haste of a precipitant zeal shall make no distinction, but resolve to stop their mouths, because we fear they come with new and dangerous opinions, as we commonly fore-judge them ere we understand them; no less than woe to us, while thinking thus to defend the gospel, we are found the persecutors!

There have been not a few since the beginning of this parliament, both of the presbytery and others, who by their unlicensed books to the contempt of an Imprimatur first broke that triple ice clung about our hearts, and taught the people to see day: I hope that none of those were the persuaders to renew upon us this bondage which they themselves have wrought so much good by condemning. But if neither the check that Moses gave to young Joshua, nor the countermand which our Saviour gave to young John, who was so ready to prohibit those whom he thought unlicensed, be not enough to admonish our elders how unacceptable to God their testy mood of prohibiting is; if neither their own remembrance what evil hath abounded in the Church by this lett of licensing, and what good they themselves have begun by transgressing it, be not enough, but that they will persuade, and execute the most Dominican part of the Inquisition over us, and are already with one foot in the stirrup so active at suppressing, it would be no unequal distribution in the first place to suppress the suppressors themselves; whom the change of their condition hath put up, more than their late experience of harder times hath made wise.

And as for regulating the press, let no man think to have the honour of advising ye better than yourselves have done in that order published next before this, "That no book be printed, unless the printer's and the author's name, or at least the printer's be registered." Those which otherwise come forth, if they be found mischievous and libellous, the fire and the executioner will be the timeliest and the most effectual remedy that man's prevention can use. For this authentic Spanish policy of licensing books, if I have said aught, will prove the most unlicensed book itself within a short while; and was the immediate image of a star-chamber decree to that purpose made in those very times when that court did the rest of those her pious works, for which she is now fallen from the stars with Lucifer. Whereby ye may guess what kind of state-prudence, what

love of the people, what care of religion, or good manners there was at the contriving, although with singular hypocrisy it pretended to bind books to their good behaviour. And how it got the upper hand of your precedent order so well constituted before, if we may believe those men whose profession gives them cause to enquire most, it may be doubted there was in it the fraud of some old Patentees and Monopolizers in the trade of book-selling; who under pretence of the poor in their company not to be defrauded, and the just retaining of each man his several copy, (which God forbid should be gain-said) brought divers glossing colours to the house, which were indeed but colours, and serving to no end except it be to exercise a superiority over their neighbours: Men who do not therefore labour in an honest profession, to which learning is indebted, that they should be made other men's vassals. Another end is thought was aimed at by some of them in procuring by petition this order, that having power in their hands, malignant books might the easier scape abroad, as the event shews. But of these Sophisms and Elenchs of merchandize I skill not: This I know, that errors in a good government and in a bad are equally almost incident; for what magistrate may not be mis-informed, and much the sooner, if liberty of printing be reduced into the power of a few? But to redress willingly and speedily what hath been erred, and in highest authority to esteem a plain advertisement more than others have done a sumptuous bride, is a virtue (honoured lords and commons!) answerable to your highest actions, and whereof none can participate, but greatest and wisest men.

THE

THE Doctrine and Discipline of DIVORCE;

Restored to the good of both sexes, from the bondage of canon law, and other mistakes, to the true meaning of scripture in the law and gospel compared.

Wherein also are set down the bad consequences of abolishing, or condemning of sin, that which the law of GOD allows, and CHRIST abolished not.

Now the second time revised, and much augmented, in Two Books: To the parliament of England, with the assembly.

Matth. xiii. 52. "Every scribe instructed in the kingdom of heaven, is like the master of a house which bringeth out of his treasury things new and old."

Prov. xviii. 13. "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him."

To the Parliament of England, with the Assembly.

IF it were seriously asked, (and it would be no untimely question,) renowned parliament, select assembly! who of all teachers and masters that have ever taught, hath drawn the most disciples after him, both in religion and in manners? it might be not untruly answered, custom. Tho' virtue be commended for the most perswasive in her Theory, and conscience in the plain demonstration of the spirit finds most evincing; yet whether it be the secret of divine will, or the original blindness we are born in, so it happens for the most part, that custom still is silently received for the best instructor. Except it be, because her method is so glib and easy, in some manner like to that vision of Ezekiel, rowling up her sudden book of implicit knowledge, for him that will, to take and swallow down at pleasure; which proving but of bad nourishment in the concoction, as it was heedless in the devouring, puffs up unhealthily a certain big face of pretended learning, mistaken among credulous men for the wholesome habit of soundness and good constitution, but is indeed no other than that swoln visage of counterfeit knowledge and literature, which not only in private mars our education, but also in publick is the common climber into every chair, where either religion is preached, or law reported: filling each estate of life and profession with abject and servile principles, depressing the high and heaven-born spirit of man, far beneath the condition wherein either God created him, or sin hath sunk him. To pursue the allegory, custom being but a meer face, as echo is a meer voice, rests not in her unaccomplishment; until by secret inclination she accorporate her self with error, who being a blind and serpentine body without a head, willingly accepts what he wants, and supplies what her incompleatness went seeking. Hence it is, that error supports custom, custom countenances error: and these two between them would persecute and chase away all truth and solid wisdom out of human life, were it not
that

that God, rather than man, once in many ages, calls together the prudent and religious counsels of men, deputed to repress the incroachments, and to work off the inveterate blots and obscurities wrought upon our minds by the subtle insinuating of error and custom; who with the numerous and vulgar train of their followers, make it their chief design to envy and cry down the industry of free reasoning, under the terms of humour and innovation; as if the womb of teeming truth were to be closed up, if she presume to bring forth aught that sorts not with their unchewed notions and suppositions. Against which notorious injury, and abuse of man's free soul, to testify and oppose the utmost that study and true labour can attain, heretofore the incitement of men reputed grave, hath led me among others; and now the duty and the right of an instructed Christian calls me thro' the chance of good or evil report, to be the sole advocate of a discountenanced truth: a high enterprise, lords and commons! a high enterprise and a hard, and such as every seventh son of a seventh son does not venture on. Nor have I amidst the clamour of so much envy and impertinence, whither to appeal, but to the concurrence of so much piety and wisdom here assembled. Bringing in my hands an ancient and most necessary, most charitable, and yet most injur'd statute of Moses; not repealed ever by him who only had the authority, but thrown aside with much inconsiderate neglect, under the rubbish of canonical ignorance; as once the whole law was by some such like conveyance in Josiah's time. And he who shall endeavour the amendment of any old neglected grievance in Church or state, or in the daily course of life, if he be gifted with abilities of mind that may raise him to so high an undertaking, I grant he hath already much whereof not to repent him; yet let me arreel him, not to be the foreman of any misjudg'd opinion, unless his resolutions be firmly seated in a square and constant mind, not conscious to itself of any deserved blame, and regardless of ungrounded suspicions. For this let him be sure he shall be boarded presently by the ruder sort, but not by discreet and well-nurtured men, with a thousand idle descants and surmises. Who when they cannot confute the least joint or sinew of any passage in the book; yet God forbid that truth should be truth, because they have a boisterous conceit of some pretences in the writer. But were they not more busy and inquisitive than the Apostle commends, they would hear him at least, "rejoicing so the truth be preached, whether of envy or other pretence whatsoever:" for truth is as impossible to be soiled by any outward touch, as the sun-beam; though this ill hap wait on her nativity, that she never comes into the world, but like a bastard, to the ignominy of him that brought her forth; till time, the midwife rather than the mother of truth, have washed and salted the infant, declared her legitimate, and church'd the father of his young Minerva, from the needless causes of his purgation. Yourselves can best witness this, worthy patriots! and better will, no doubt, hereafter: for who among ye of the foremost that have travailed in her behalf to the good of Church or state, hath not been often traduced to be the agent of his own by-ends, under pretext of reformation? So much the more I shall not be unjust to hope, that however infamy or envy may work in other men to do her fretful will against this discourse, yet that the experience of your own uprightness mis-interpreted, will put ye in mind to give it free audience and generous construction. What though the brood of Belial, the draffe of men, to whom no liberty is pleasing, but unbridled and vagabond lust without pale or partition, will laugh broad perhaps, to see so great a strength of Scripture mustering up in favour, as they suppose, of their debaucheries; they will know better when they shall hence learn, that honest liberty is the greatest foe to dishonest licence. And what though others, out of a waterish and queasy conscience, because ever crazy and never yet sound, will rail and fancy to themselves, that injury and licence is the best of this book? Did not the distemper of their own stomachs affect them with a dizzy megrim, they would soon tie up their tongues, and discern themselves like that Assyrian blasphemer, all this while reproaching not man, but the Almighty, the Holy-One of Israel, whom they do not deny to have belawgiven his own sacred people with

with this very allowance, which they now call injury and licence, and dare cry shame on, and will do yet a while, till they get a little cordial sobriety to settle their qualming zeal. But this question concerns not us perhaps: indeed man's disposition, though prone to search after vain curiosities, yet when points of difficulty are to be discusst, appertaining to the removal of unreasonable wrong and burden from the perplext life of our brother, it is incredible how cold, how dull, and far from all fellow-feeling we are, without the spur of self-concernment. Yet if the wisdom, the justice, the purity of God be to be clear'd from foulest imputations, which are not yet avoided; if charity be not to be degraded and trodden down under a civil ordinance; if matrimony be not to be advanced like that exalted perdition written of to the Theſſalonians, "above all that is called God," or goodness, nay against them both; then I dare affirm there will be found in the contents of this book, that which may concern us all. You it concerns chiefly, worthies in parliament! on whom as on our deliverers, all our grievances and cares, by the merit of your eminence and fortitude, are devolved. Me it concerns next, having with much labour and faithful diligence first found out, or at least with a fearless and communicative candor first published to the manifest good of christendom, that which calling to witness every thing mortal and immortal, I believe unfeignedly to be true. Let not other men think their conscience bound to search continually after truth, to pray for enlightening from above, to publish what they think they have so obtained, and debar me from conceiving myself tyed by the same duties. Ye have now, doubtless, by the favour and appointment of God, ye have now in your hands a great and populous nation to reform; from what corruption, what blindness in religion, ye know well; in what a degenerate and fallen spirit from the apprehension of native liberty, and true manliness, I am sure ye find; with what unbounded licence rushing to whoredoms and adulteries, needs not long enquiry: inso-much that the fears which men have of too strict a discipline, perhaps exceed the hopes that can be in others, of ever introducing it with any great success. What if I should tell ye now of dispensations and indulgences, to give a little the reins, to let them play and nibble with the bait a while; a people as hard of heart as that Egyptian colony that went to Canaan. This is the common doctrine that adulterous and injurious divorces were not connived only, but with eye open allowed of old for hardness of heart. But that opinion, I trust, by then this following argument hath been well read, will be left for one of the mysteries of an indulgent antichrist, to farm out incest by, and those his other tributary pollutions. What middle way can be taken then, may some interrupt, if we must neither turn to the right, nor to the left, and that the people hate to be reformed? Mark then, judges and law-givers, and ye whose office it is to be our teachers, for I will utter now a doctrine, if ever any other, though neglected or not understood, yet of great and powerful importance to the governing of mankind. He who wisely would restrain the reasonable soul of man within due bounds, must first himself know perfectly, how far the territory and dominion extends of just and honest liberty. As little must he offer to bind that which God hath loosened, as to loosen that which he hath bound. The ignorance and mistake of this high point, hath heapt up one huge half of all the misery that hath been since Adam. In the gospel we shall read a supercilious crew of masters, whose holiness, or rather whose evil eye, grieving that God should be so facil to man, was to set straiter limits to obedience than God had set, to enslave the dignity of man, to put a garrison upon his neck of empty and over-dignified precepts: And we shall read our Saviour never more grieved and troubled, than to meet with such a peevish madness among men against their own freedom. How can we expect him to be less offended with us, when much of the same folly shall be found yet remaining where it least ought, to the perishing of thousands? The greatest burden in the world is superstition, not only of ceremonies in the Church, but of imaginary and scarecrow sins at home. What greater weakening, what more subtle stratagem against our Christian warfare, when besides the gross body of real transgressions to incounter, we shall be terrified by a vain and shadowy

menacing of faults that are not: When things indifferent shall be set to over-front us under the banners of sin, what wonder if we be routed, and by this art of our adversary, fall into the subjection of worst and deadliest offences? The superstition of the Papist is, "touch not, taste not," when God bids both; and ours is, "part not, separate not," when God and charity both permits and commands. "Let all your things be done with charity," saith St. Paul; and his master saith, "She is the fulfilling of the law." Yet now a civil, an indifferent, a sometime dissuaded law of marriage, must be forced upon us to fulfil, not only without charity, but against her. No place in heaven or earth, except hell, where charity may not enter: yet marriage, the ordinance of our solace and contentment, the remedy of our loneliness, will not admit now either of charity or mercy, to come in and mediate, or pacify the fierceness of this gentle ordinance, the unremedied loneliness of this remedy. Advise ye well, supreme senate, if charity be thus excluded and expelled, how ye will defend the untainted honour of your own actions and proceedings. He who marries, intends as little to conspire his own ruin, as he that swears allegiance: and as a whole people is in proportion to an ill government, so is one man to an ill marriage. If they, against any authority, covenant, or statute, may by the sovereign edict of charity, save not only their lives, but honest liberties from unworthy bondage, as well may he against any private covenant, which he never entered to his mischief, redeem himself from unsupportable disturbances to honest peace, and just contentment: And much the rather, for that to resist the highest magistrate though tyrannizing, God never gave us express allowance, only he gave us reason, charity, nature, and good example to bear us out; but in this oeconomical misfortune thus to demean ourselves, besides the warrant of those four great directors, which doth as justly belong hither, we have an express law of God, and such a law, as whereof our Saviour with a solemn threat forbid the abrogating. For no effect of tyranny can sit more heavy on the common-wealth, than this household unhappiness on the family. And farewell all hope of true reformation in the state, while such an evil as this lies undiscerned or unregarded in the house: On the redress whereof depends not only the spiritul and orderly life of our grown men, but the willing and careful education of our children. Let this therefore be new examined, this tenure and freehold of mankind, this native and domestic charter given us by a greater lord than that Saxon king the confessor. Let the statutes of God be turned over, be scanned anew, and considered not altogether by the narrow intellectuals of quotationists and common places, but (as was the ancient right of councils) by men of what liberal profession soever, of eminent spirit and breeding, joined with a diffuse and various knowledge of divine and human things; able to ballance and define good and evil, right and wrong, throughout every state of life; able to shew us the ways of the Lord strait and faithful as they are, not full of cranks and contradictions, and pit-falling dispensés, but with divine insight and benignity measured out to the proportion of each mind and spirit, each temper and disposition created so different each from other, and yet by the skill of wise conducting, all to become uniform in virtue. To expedite these knots, were worthy a learned and memorable synod; while our enemies expect to see the expectation of the Church tired out with dependencies and independencies how they will compound, and in what calends. Doubt not, worthy senators! to vindicate the sacred honour and judgment of Moses your predecessor, from the shallow commenting of scholastics and canonists. Doubt not after him to reach out your steady hands to the mis-informed and wearied life of man; to restore this his lost heritage, into the household state; wherewith be sure that peace and love, the best subsistence of a Christian family, will return home from whence they are now banisht; places of prostitution will be less haunted, the neighbour's bed less attempted, the yoke of prudent and manly discipline will be generally submitted to; sober and well-ordered living will soon spring up in the commonwealth. Ye have an author great beyond exception, Moses; and one yet greater, he who hedged in from abolishing every smallest jot and tittle of precious equity contained in that law, with a more accurate
and

and lasting Masoreth, than either the synagogue of Ezra or the Galilæan school at Tiberias hath left us. Whatever else ye can enact, will scarce concern a third part of the British name: but the benefit and good of this your magnanimous example, will easily spread far beyond the banks of Tweed and the Norman isles. It would not be the first, or second time, since our ancient Druids, by whom this island was the cathedral of philosophy to France, left off their pagan rites, that England hath had this honour vouchsafed from heaven, to give out reformation to the world. Who was it but our English Constantine that baptized the Roman empire? Who but the Northumbrian Willibrode, and Wini-fride of Devon, with their followers, were the first Apostles of Germany? Who but Alcuin and Wickliff our countrymen opened the eyes of Europe, the one in arts, the other in religion? Let not England forget her precedence of teaching nations how to live.

Know, worthies! know and exercise the privilege of your honoured country. A greater title I here bring ye, than is either in the power or in the policy of Rome to give her Monarchs; this glorious act will stile ye the defenders of charity. Nor is this yet the highest inscription that will adorn so religious and so holy a defence as this: behold here the pure and sacred law of God, and his yet purer and more sacred name offering themselves to you, first of all Christian reformers, to be acquitted from the long-suffered ungodly attribute of patronizing adultery. Defer not to wipe off instantly these imputative blurs and stains cast by rude fancies upon the throne and beauty itself of inviolable holiness: lest some other people more devout and wise than we bereave us this offered immortal glory, our wonted prerogative, of being the first asserters in every great vindication. For me, as far as my part leads me, I have already my greatest gain, assurance, and inward satisfaction to have done in this nothing unworthy of an honest life, and studies well employed. With what event, among the wise and right understanding handful of men, I am secure. But how among the drove of custom and prejudice this will be relished by such whose capacity, since their youth run ahead into the easy creek of a system or a medulla, fails there at will under the blown physiognomy of their unlaboured rudiments; for them, what their taste will be, I have also surety sufficient, from the entire league that hath ever been between formal ignorance and grave obstinacy. Yet when I remember the little that our Saviour could prevail about this doctrine of charity against the crabbed textuists of his time, I make no wonder, but rest confident that whoso prefers either matrimony or other ordinance before the good of man and the plain exigence of charity, let him profess Papist or Protestant or what he will, he is no better than a Pharisee, and understands not the gospel: whom as a misinterpreter of Christ I openly protest against; and provoke him to the trial of this truth before all the world: and let him bethink him withal how he will fodder up the shifting flaws of his ungirt permissions, his venial and unvenial dispensations, wherewith the law of God pardoning and unpardoning hath been shamefully branded for want of heed in glossing, to have eluded and baffled out all Faith and chastity from the marriage-bed of that holy seed, with politic and judicial adulteries. I seek not to seduce the simple and illiterate; my errand is to find out the choicest and the learnedest, who have this high gift of wisdom to answer solidly, or to be convinced. I crave it from the piety, the learning, and the prudence which is housed in this place. It might perhaps more fitly have been written in another tongue: and I had done so, but that the esteem I have of my country's judgment, and the love I bear to my native language to serve it first with what I endeavour, made me speak it thus, ere I assay the verdict of outlandish readers. And perhaps also here I might have ended nameless, but that the address of these lines chiefly to the parliament of England might have seemed ingrateful not to acknowledge by whose religious care, unwearied watchfulness, couragious and heroic resolutions, I enjoy the peace and studious leisure to remain,

The Honourer and Attendant of their Noble Worth and Virtues,

JOHN MILTON.

The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce; restored to the good of both Sexes.

BOOK I.

The PREFACE.

That man is the occasion of his own miseries, in most of those evils which he imputes to God's inflicting. The absurdity of our canonists in their decrees about divorce. The Christian imperial laws framed with more equity. The opinion of Hugo Grotius and Paulus Fagius : And the purpose in general of this discourse.

MANY men, whether it be their fate, or fond opinion, easily persuade themselves, if God would but be pleased a while to withdraw his just punishments from us, and to restrain what power either the devil or any earthly enemy hath to work us woe, that then man's nature would find immediate rest and releasement from all evils. But verily they who think so, if they be such as have a mind large enough to take into their thoughts a general survey of human things, would soon prove themselves in that opinion far deceived. For though it were granted us by divine indulgence to be exempt from all that can be harmful to us from without, yet the perverseness of our folly is so bent, that we should never leave * hammering out of our own hearts, as it were out of a flint, the seeds and sparkles of new misery to ourselves, till all were in a blaze again. And no marvel if out of our own hearts, for they are evil ; but even out of those things which God meant us, either for a principal good, or a pure contentment, we are still hatching and contriving upon ourselves matter of continual sorrow and perplexity. What greater good to man than that revealed rule, whereby God vouchsafes to shew us how he would be worshipped ? And yet that not rightly understood, became the cause that once a famous man in Israel could not but oblige his conscience to be the sacrificer ; or if not, the jaylor of his innocent and only daughter : And was the cause oft-times that armies of valiant men have given up their throats to a heathenish enemy on the sabbath-day ; fondly thinking their defensive resistance to be as then a work unlawful. What thing more instituted to the solace and delight of man than marriage ? and yet the misinterpreting of some Scripture directed mainly against the abusers of the law for divorce given by Moses, hath changed the blessing of matrimony not seldom into a familiar and co-inhabiting mischief ; at least into a drooping and disconsolate household captivity, without refuge or redemption. So ungoverned and so wild a race doth superstition run us, from one extreme of abused liberty into the other of unmerciful restraint. For although God in the first ordaining of marriage, taught us to what end he did it, in words expressly implying the apt and chearful conversation of man with woman, to comfort and refresh him against the evil of solitary life, not mentioning the purpose of generation till afterwards, as being but a secondary end in dignity, tho' not in necessity ; yet now, if any two be but once handed in the Church, and have tasted in any sort the nuptial bed, let them find themselves never so mistaken in their dispositions through any error, concealment, or misadventure, that through their different tempers, thoughts, and constitutions, they can neither be to one another a remedy against loneliness, nor live in any union or contentment all their days ; yet they shall, so they be but found suitably weaponed to the least

* The first edition has *lin*, a contraction.

possibility of sensual enjoyment, be made, spight of Antipathy, to fadge together, and combine as they may to their unspeakable wearisomeness, and despair of all sociable delight in the ordinance which God established to that very end. What a calamity is this, and as the wise-man, if he were alive, would sigh out in his own phrase, what a "fore evil is this under the sun!" All which we can refer justly to no other author than the Canon law and her adherents, not consulting with charity, the interpreter and guide of our faith, but resting in the mere element of the text; doubtless by the policy of the devil to make that gracious ordinance become unsupportable, that what with men not daring to venture upon wedlock, and what with men wearied out of it, all inordinate licence might abound. It was for many ages that marriage lay in disgrace with most of the ancient doctors, as a work of the flesh, almost a defilement, wholly denied to priests, and the second time dissuaded to all, as he that reads Tertullian or Jerom may see at large. Afterwards it was thought so sacramental, that no adultery or desertion could dissolve it; and this is the sense of our canon courts in England to this day, but in no other reformed Church else: yet there remains in them also a burden on it as heavy as the other two were disgraceful or superstitious, and of as much iniquity, crossing a law not only written by Moses, but charactered in us by nature, of more antiquity and deeper ground than marriage itself; which law is to force nothing against the faultless proprieties of nature: yet that this may be colourably done, our Saviour's words touching divorce, are as it were congealed into a stony rigor, inconsistent both with his doctrine and his office; and that which he preached only to the conscience, is by canonical tyranny snatched into the compulsive censure of a judicial court; where laws are imposed even against the venerable and secret power of nature's impression, to love, whatever cause be found to loath: Which is a heinous barbarism both against the honour of marriage, the dignity of man and his soul, the goodness of Christianity, and all the human respects of civility. Notwithstanding that some the wisest and gravest among the Christian emperors, who had about them, to consult with, those of the fathers then living; who for their learning and holiness of life, are still with us in great renown, have made their statutes and edicts concerning this debate far more easy and relenting in many necessary cases, wherein the canon is inflexible. And Hugo Grotius, a man of these times, one of the best learned, seems not obscurely to adhere in his persuasion to the equity of those imperial decrees, in his notes upon the Evangelists; much allaying the outward roughness of the text, which hath for the most part been too immoderately expounded; and excites the diligence of others to inquire further into this question, as containing many points that have not yet been explained. Which ever likely to remain intricate and hopeless upon the suppositions commonly stuck to, the authority of Paulus Fagius, one so learned and so eminent in England once, if it might persuade, would strait acquaint us with a solution of these differences, no less prudent than compendious. He in his comment on the Pentateuch, doubted not to maintain that divorces might be as lawfully permitted by the magistrate to Christians, as they were to the Jews. But because he is but brief, and these things of great consequence not to be kept obscure, I shall conceive it nothing above my duty, either for the difficulty or the censure that may pass thereon, to communicate such thoughts as I also have had, and do offer them now in this general labour of reformation to the candid view both of Church and magistrate: especially because I see it the hope of good men, that those irregular and unspiritual courts have spun their utmost date in this land, and some better course must now be constituted. This therefore shall be the task and period of this discourse to prove, first, that other reasons of divorce, besides adultery, were by the law of Moses, and are yet to be allowed by the Christian magistrate as a piece of justice, and that the words of Christ are not hereby contraried. Next, that to prohibit absolutely any divorce whatsoever, except those which Moses excepted, is against the reason of law, as in due place I shall shew out of Fagius with many additions. He therefore who by adventuring, shall be so happy as with success to light the way of such an expedient

pedient liberty and truth as this, shall restore the much-wronged and over-sorrowed state of matrimony, not only to those merciful and life-giving remedies of Moses, but as much as may be, to that serene and blissful condition it was in at the beginning, and shall deserve of all apprehensive men, (considering the troubles and distempers which for want of this insight have been so oft in kingdoms, in states and families) shall deserve to be reckoned among the public benefactors of civil and human life, above the inventors of wine and oil; for this is a far dearer, far nobler, and more desirable cherishing to man's life, unworthily exposed to sadness and mistake, which he shall vindicate. Not that licence, and levity, and unconsented breach of faith should herein be countenanced, but that some conscionable and tender pity might be had of those who have unwarily, in a thing they never practised before, made themselves the bondmen of a luckless and helpless matrimony. In which argument, he whose courage can serve him to give the first onset, must look for two several oppositions; the one from those who having sworn themselves to long custom, and the letter of the text, will not out of the road: the other from those whose gross and vulgar apprehensions conceit but low of matrimonial purposes, and in the work of male and female think they have all. Nevertheless, it shall be here sought by due ways to be made appear, that those words of God in the institution, promising a meet help against loneliness, and those words of Christ, "That his yoke is easy, and his burden light," were not spoken in vain; for if the knot of marriage may in no case be dissolved but for adultery, all the burdens and services of the law are not so intolerable. This only is desired of them who are minded to judge hardly of thus maintaining, that they would be still, and hear all out, nor think it equal to answer deliberate reason with sudden heat and noise; remembering this, that many truths now of reverend esteem and credit, had their birth and beginning once from singular and private thoughts, while the most of men were otherwise possessed; and had the fate at first to be generally exploded and exclaimed on by many violent opposers: yet I may err perhaps in soothing myself, that this present truth revived, will deserve on all hands to be not sinisterly received, in that it undertakes the cure of an inveterate disease crept into the best part of human society; and to do this with no smarting corrosive, but with a smooth and pleasing lesson, which received, hath the virtue to soften and dispel rooted and knotty sorrows, and without enchantment, if that be feared, or spell used, hath regard at once both to serious pity and upright honesty; that tends to the redeeming and restoring of none but such as are the object of compassion, having in an ill hour hampered themselves, to the utter dispatch of all their most beloved comforts and repose for this life's term. But if we shall obstinately dislike this new overture of unexpected ease and recovery, what remains but to deplore the frowardness of our hopeless condition, which neither can endure the estate we are in, nor admit of remedy either sharp or sweet. Sharp we ourselves distaste; and sweet, under whose hands we are, is scrupled and suspected as too luscious. In such a posture Christ found the Jews, who were neither won with the austerity of John the Baptist, and thought it too much licence to follow freely the charming pipe of him who sounded and proclaimed liberty and relief to all distresses: yet truth in some age or other will find her witness, and shall be justified at last by her own children.

C H A P. I.

The position proved by the law of Moses. That law expounded and asserted to a moral and charitable use, first by Paulus Fagius, next with other additions.

TO remove therefore, if it be possible, this great and sad oppression which through the strictness of a literal interpreting hath invaded and disturbed the dearest and most peaceable estate of household society, to the over-burthening, if not the overwhelming of many christians better worth than to be so deserted of the church's considerate care, this position shall be laid down, first proving, then answering what may be objected either from scripture or light of reason.

“That indisposition, unfitness, or contrariety of mind, arising from a cause in nature unchangeable, hindering, and ever likely to hinder the main benefits of conjugal society, which are solace and peace; is a greater reason of divorce than natural frigidity, especially if there be no children, and that there be mutual consent.”

This I gather from the law in Deut. xxiv. 1. “When a man hath taken a wife and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her, let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house,” &c. This law, if the words of Christ may be admitted into our belief, shall never while the world stands, for him be abrogated. First therefore I here set down what learned Fagius hath observ'd on this law; “The law of God,” saith he, “permitted divorce for the help of human weakness. For every one that of necessity separates, cannot live single. That Christ denied divorce to his own, hinders not; for what is that to the unregenerate, who hath not attained such perfection? Let not the remedy be despised which was given to weakness. And when Christ saith, who marries the divorced commits adultery, it is to be understood if he had any plot in the divorce.” The rest I reserve until it be disputed, how the magistrate is to do herein. From hence we may plainly discern a two-fold consideration in this law: first, the end of the law-giver, and the proper act of the law, to command or to allow something just and honest, or indifferent. Secondly, his sufferance from some accidental result of evil by this allowance, which the law cannot remedy. For if this law have no other end or act but only the allowance of sin, though never to so good intention, that law is no law, but sin muffled in the robe of law, or law disguised in the loose garment of sin. Both which are too foul Hypotheses, to save the Phænomenon of our Saviour's answer to the Pharisees about this matter. And I trust anon by the help of an infallible guide to perfect such Prutenic tables as shall mend the Astronomy of our wide expositors.

The cause of divorce mentioned in the law, is translated “some uncleanness,” but in the Hebrew it sounds “nakedness of ought, or any real nakedness:” which by all the learned interpreters is referred to the mind as well as to the body. And what greater nakedness or unfitness of mind than that which hinders ever the solace and peaceful society of the married couple; and what hinders that more than the unfitness and defectiveness of an unconjugal mind? The cause therefore of divorce expressed in the position, cannot but agree with that described in the best and equallest sense of Moses's law. Which being a matter of pure charity, is plainly moral, and more now in force than ever; therefore surely lawful. For if under the law such was God's gracious indulgence, as not to suffer the ordinance of his goodness and favour through any error to be feared and stigmatized upon his servants to their misery and thralldom; much less will he suffer

fer it now under the covenant of grace, by abrogating his former grant of remedy and relief. But the first institution will be objected to have ordained marriage inseparable. To that a little patience until this first part have amply discoursed the grave and pious reasons of this divorcive law; and then I doubt not but with one gentle stroaking to wipe away ten thousand tears out of the life of man. Yet thus much I shall now insist on, that whatever the institution were, it could not be so enormous, nor so rebellious against both nature and reason, as to exalt itself above the end and person for whom it was instituted.

C H A P. II.

The first reason of this law grounded on the prime reason of matrimony. That no covenant whatsoever obliges against the main end both of itself, and of the parties covenanting.

FOR all sense and equity reclaims that any law or covenant, how solemn or strait soever, either between God and man, or man and man, though of God's joining, should bind against a prime and principal scope of its own institution, and of both or either party covenanting: neither can it be of force to engage a blameless creature to his own perpetual sorrow, mistaken for his expected solace, without suffering charity to step in and do a confessed good work of parting those, whom nothing holds together but this of God's joining, falsely supposed against the express end of his own ordinance. And what his chief end was of creating woman to be joined with man, his own instituting words declare, and are infallible to inform us what is marriage, and what is no marriage; unless we can think them set there to no purpose: "It is not good," saith he, "that man should be alone, I will make him a help-meet for him." From which words so plain, less cannot be concluded, nor is by any learned interpreter, than that in God's intention a meet and happy conversation is the chiefest and the noblest end of marriage: for we find here no expression so necessarily implying carnal knowledge, as this prevention of loneliness to the mind and spirit of man. To this, Fagius, Calvin, Pareus, Rivetus, as willingly and largely assent as can be wished. And indeed it is a greater blessing from God, more worthy so excellent a creature as man is, and a higher end to honour and sanctify the league of marriage, whenas the solace and satisfaction of the mind is regarded and provided for before the sensitive pleasing of the body. And with all generous persons married thus it is, that where the mind and person pleases aptly, there some unaccomplishment of the body's delight may be better borne with, than when the mind hangs off in an unclosing disproportion, though the body be as it ought: for there all corporal delight will soon become unfavoury and contemptible. And the solitariness of man, which God had namely and principally ordered to prevent by marriage, hath no remedy, but lies under a worse condition than the loneliest single life: for in single life the absence and remoteness of a helper might inure him to expect his own comforts out of himself, or to seek with hope: but here the continual fight of his deluded thoughts without cure, must needs be to him, if especially his complexion incline him to melancholy, a daily trouble and pain of loss, in some degree like that which reprobates feel. Lest therefore so noble a creature as man should be shut up incurably under a worse evil by an easy mistake in that ordinance which God gave him to remedy a less evil, reaping to himself sorrow while he went to rid away solitariness, it cannot avoid to be concluded, that if the woman be naturally so of disposition, as will not help to remove, but help to increase that same God-forbidden loneliness, which will in time draw on with it a general discomfort and dejection of mind, not befitting either christian profession, or moral conversation, unprofitable and dangerous

rous to the common-wealth, when the household estate, out of which must flourish forth the vigour and spirit of all public enterprizes, is so ill-contented and procured at home, and cannot be supported; such a marriage can be no marriage, whereto the most honest end is wanting: and the aggrieved person shall do more manly, to be extraordinary and singular in claiming the due right whereof he is frustrated, than to piece up his lost contentment by visiting the stews, or stepping to his neighbour's bed; which is the common shift in this misfortune: or else by suffering his useful life to waste away, and be lost under a secret affliction of an unconscionable size to human strength. Against all which evils, the mercy of this Mosaic law was graciously exhibited.

C H A P. III.

The ignorance and iniquity of canon law, providing for the right of the body in marriage, but nothing for the wrongs and grievances of the mind. An objection, that the mind should be better lookt to before contract, answered.

HOW vain therefore is it, and how preposterous in the canon law, to have made such careful provision against the impediment of carnal performance, and to have had no care about the unconversing inability of mind, so defective to the purest and most sacred end of matrimony; and that the vessel of voluptuous enjoyment must be made good to him that has taken it upon trust, without any caution: whenas the mind, from whence must flow the acts of peace and love, a far more precious mixture than the quintessence of an excrement, though it be found never so deficient and unable to perform the best duty of marriage in a chearful and agreeable conversation, shall be thought good enough, however flat and melancholious it be, and must serve, though to the eternal disturbance and languishing of him that complains? Yet wisdom and charity weighing God's own institution, would think that the pining of a sad spirit wedded to loneliness, should deserve to be freed, as well as the impatience of a sensual desire so providently relieved. 'Tis read to us in the liturgy, that "we must not marry to satisfy the fleshly appetite, like brute beasts, that have no understanding:" but the canon so runs, as if it dreamed of no other matter than such an appetite to be satisfied; for if it happen that nature hath stopt or extinguished the veins of sensuality, that marriage is annulled. But though all the faculties of the understanding and conversing part, after trial appear to be so ill and so averfely met through nature's unalterable working, as that neither peace, nor any sociable contentment can follow, 'tis as nothing; the contract shall stand as firm as ever, betide what will. What is this but secretly to instruct us, that however many grave reasons are pretended to the married life, yet that nothing indeed is thought worth regard therein, but the prescribed satisfaction of an irrational heat? Which cannot be but ignominious to the state of marriage, dishonourable to the undervalued soul of man, and even to christian doctrine itself: While it seems more moved at the disappointing of an impetuous nerve, than at the ingenuous grievance of a mind unreasonably yoked; and to place more of marriage in the channel of concupiscence, than in the pure influence of peace and love, whereof the soul's lawful contentment is the only fountain.

But some are ready to object, that the disposition ought seriously to be considered before. But let them know again, that for all the wariness can be used, it may yet befall a discreet man to be mistaken in his choice, and we have plenty of examples. The soberest and best-governed men are least practised in these affairs; and who knows

not

not that the bashful muteness of a virgin may oft-times hide all the unliveliness and natural sloth which is really unfit for conversation; nor is there that freedom of access granted or presumed, as may suffice to a perfect discerning till too late: and where any indisposition is suspected, what more usual than the persuasion of friends, that acquaintance as it increases, will amend all? And lastly, it is not strange though many who have spent their youth chaste, are in some things not so quick-sighted, while they haste too eagerly to light the nuptial torch; nor is it therefore that for a modest error a man should forfeit so great a happiness, and no charitable means to release him: since they who have lived most loosely by reason of their bold accustoming, prove most successful in their matches, because their wild affections unsettle at will, have been as so many divorces to teach them experience. Whenas the sober man honouring the appearance of modesty, and hoping well of every social virtue under that veil, may easily chance to meet, if not with a body impenetrable, yet often with a mind to all other due conversation inaccessible, and to all the more estimable and superior purposes of matrimony useless and almost lifeless: and what a solace, what a fit help such a consort would be through the whole life of a man, is less pain to conjecture than to have experience.

C H A P. IV.

The second reason of this law, because without it, marriage as it happens oft is not a remedy of that which it promises, as any rational creature would expect. That marriage if we pattern from the beginning, as our Saviour bids, was not properly the remedy of lust, but the fulfilling of conjugal love and helpfulness.

AND that we may further see what a violent cruel thing it is to force the continuing of those together, whom God and nature in the gentlest end of marriage never joined; divers evils and extremities that follow upon such a compulsion, shall here be set in view. Of evils, the first and greatest is, that hereby a most absurd and rash imputation is fixed upon God and his holy laws, of conniving and dispensing with open and common adultery among his chosen people; a thing which the rankest politician would think it shame and disworship that his laws should countenance: how and in what manner that comes to pass, I shall reserve till the course of method brings on the unfolding of many scriptures. Next, the law and gospel are hereby made liable to more than one contradiction, which I refer also thither. Lastly, the supreme dictate of charity is hereby many ways neglected and violated; which I shall forthwith address to prove. First, we know St. Paul saith, It is better to marry than to burn. Marriage therefore was given as a remedy of that trouble; but what might this burning mean? Certainly not the meer motion of carnal lust, not the meer goad of a sensitive desire: God does not principally take care for such cattle. What is it then but that desire which God put into Adam in paradise, before he knew the sin of incontinence; that desire which God saw it was not good that man should be left alone to burn in, the desire and longing to put off an unkindly solitariness by uniting another body, but not without a fit soul to his, in the chearful society of wedlock? Which if it were so needful before the fall, when man was much more perfect in himself, how much more is it needful now against all the sorrows and casualties of this life, to have an intimate and speaking help, a ready and reviving associate in marriage? whereof who misses, by chancing on a mute
and

and spiritless mate, remains more alone than before, and in a burning less to be contained than that which is fleshly, and more to be considered; as being more deeply rooted even in the faultless innocence of nature. As for that other burning, which is but as it were the venom of a lusty and over-abounding concoction, strict life and labour, with the abatement of a full diet, may keep that low and obedient enough: but this pure and more inbred desire of joining to itself in conjugal fellowship a fit conversing soul (which desire is properly called love) "is stronger than death," as the spouse of Christ thought; "many waters cannot quench it, neither can the floods drown it." This is that rational burning that marriage is to remedy, not to be allayed with fasting, nor with any penance to be subdued: which how can he assuage who by mis-hap hath met the most unmeet and unsuitable mind? who hath the power to struggle with an intelligible flame, not in paradise to be resisted, become now more ardent by being failed of what in reason it looked for; and even then most unquenched, when the importunity of a provender-burning is well enough appeased; and yet the soul hath obtained nothing of what it justly desires. Certainly such a one forbidden to divorce, is in effect forbidden to marry, and compelled to greater difficulties than in a single life: for if there be not a more humane burning which marriage must satisfy, or else may be dissolved, than that of copulation, marriage cannot be honourable for the meet reducing and terminating lust between two: seeing many beasts in voluntary and chosen couples, live together as unadulterously, and are as truly married in that respect. But all ingenuous men will see that the dignity and blessing of marriage is placed rather in the mutual enjoyment of that which the wanting soul needfully seeks, than of that which the plenteous body would joyfully give away. Hence it is that Plato in his festival discourse brings in Socrates relating what he feigned to have learnt from the prophetess Diotima, how Love was the son of Penury, begot of Plenty in the garden of Jupiter. Which divinely sorts with that which in effect Moses tells us, that Love was the son of Loneliness, begot in paradise by that sociable and helpful aptitude which God implanted between man and woman toward each other. The same also is that burning mentioned by St. Paul, whereof marriage ought to be the remedy: the flesh hath other mutual and easy curbs which are in the power of any temperate man. When therefore this original and sinless Penury or Loneliness of the soul cannot lay itself down by the side of such a meet and acceptable union as God ordained in marriage, at least in some proportion, it cannot conceive and bring forth Love, but remains utterly unmarried under a formal wedlock, and still burns in the proper meaning of St. Paul. Then enters Hate, not that hate that sins, but that which only is natural dissatisfaction, and the turning aside from a mistaken object: if that mistake have done injury, it fails not to dismiss with recompence; for to retain still, and not be able to love, is to heap up more injury. Thence this wise and pious law of dismissal now defended, took beginning: He therefore who lacking of his due in the most native and humane end of marriage, thinks it better to part than to live sadly and injuriously to that chearful covenant (for not to be beloved, and yet retained, is the greatest injury to a gentle spirit) he I say, who therefore seeks to part, is one who highly honours the married life, and would not stain it: and the reasons which now move him to divorce, are equal to the best of those that could first warrant him to marry; for, as was plainly shewn, both the hate which now diverts him, and the loneliness which leads him still powerfully to seek a fit help, hath not the least grain of a sin in it, if he be worthy to understand himself.

C H A P. V.

The third reason of this law, because without it, he who has happened where he finds nothing but remediless offences and discontents, is in more and greater temptations than ever before.

THirdly : Yet it is next to be feared, if he must be still bound without reason by a deaf rigour, that when he perceives the just expectance of his mind defeated, he will begin even against law to cast about where he may find his satisfaction more compleat, unless he be a thing heroically virtuous ; and that are not the common lump of men, for whom chiefly the laws ought to be made ; though not to their sins, yet to their unfinning weaknesses, it being above their strength to endure the lonely estate, which while they shunned, they are fallen into. And yet there follows upon this a worse temptation : for if he be such as hath spent his youth unblameably, and laid up his chiefest earthly comforts in the enjoyments of a contented marriage, nor did neglect that furtherance which was to be obtained therein by constant prayers ; when he shall find himself bound fast to an uncomplying discord of nature, or, as it oft happens, to an image of earth and fleam, with whom he looked to be the copartner of a sweet and gladfome society, and sees withal that his bondage is now inevitable ; though he be almost the strongest christian, he will be ready to despair in virtue, and mutiny against divine providence : and this doubtless is the reason of those lapses and that melancholy despair which we see in many wedded persons, though they understand it not, or pretend other causes, because they know no remedy, and is of extreme danger : therefore when human frailty furcharged, is at such a loss, charity ought to venture much, and use bold physick, lest an over-toft faith indanger to shipwreck.

C H A P. VI.

The fourth reason of this law, that God regards love and peace in the family, more than a compulsive performance of marriage, which is more broke by a grievous continuance, than by a needful divorce.

Fourthly, Marriage is a covenant, the very being whereof consists not in a forced cohabitation, and counterfeit performance of duties, but in unfeigned love and peace : And of matrimonial love, no doubt but that was chiefly meant, which by the ancient fages was thus parabled ; that love, if he be not twin-born, yet hath a brother wondrous like him, called Anteros ; whom while he seeks all about, his chance is to meet with many false and feigning desires that wander singly up and down in his likeness : By them in their borrowed garb, Love though not wholly blind, as poets wrong him, yet having but one eye, as being born an archer aiming, and that eye not the quickest in this dark region here below, which is not Love's proper sphere, partly out of the simplicity and credulity which is native to him, often deceived, imbraces and consorts him with these obvious and suborned striplings, as if they were his mother's own sons ; for so he thinks them, while they subtilly keep themselves most on his blind side. But after a while, as his manner is, when soaring up into the high tower of his Apogæum, above the shadow of the earth, he darts out the direct rays of his then most piercing eye-sight upon the impostures, and trim disguises that were used with him, and discerns that this is not his
genuine

genuine brother as he imagined; he has no longer the power to hold fellowship with such a personated mate: for strait his arrows lose their golden heads, and shed their purple feathers, his silken braids untwine, and slip their knots, and that original and fiery virtue given him by fate all on a sudden goes out, and leaves him undeified and despoiled of all his force; till finding Anteros at last, he kindles and repairs the almost faded ammunition of his deity by the reflection of a coequal and homogeneal fire. Thus mine author sung it to me: and by the leave of those who would be counted the only grave ones, this is no meer amatorious novel (though to be wise and skilful in these matters, men heretofore of greatest name in virtue, have esteemed it one of the highest arcs that human contemplation circling upwards, can make from the globy sea whereon she stands:) but this is a deep and serious verity, shewing us that love in marriage cannot live nor subsist unless it be mutual; and where love cannot be, there can be left of wedlock nothing but the empty husk of an outside matrimony, as undelightful and unpleasing to God, as any other kind of hypocrisy. So far is his command from tying men to the observance of duties which there is no help for, but they must be dissembled. If Solomon's advice be not over-frolic, "Live joyfully," saith he, "with the wife whom thou lovest, all thy days, for that is thy portion." How then, where we find it impossible to rejoice or to love, can we obey this precept? How miserably do we defraud ourselves of that comfortable portion which God gives us, by striving vainly to glue an error together, which God and nature will not join, adding but more vexation and violence to that blissful society by our importunate superstition, that will not hearken to St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. who speaking of marriage and divorce, determines plain enough in general, that God therein "hath called us to peace, and not to bondage." Yea, God himself commands in his law more than once, and by his prophet Malachy, as Calvin and the best translations read, that "he who hates, let him divorce," that is, he who cannot love. Hence it is that the Rabbins, and Maimonides famous among the rest, in a book of his set forth by Buxtorfius, tells us, that "Divorce was permitted by Moses to preserve peace in marriage, and quiet in the family." Surely the Jews had their saving peace about them as well as we, yet care was taken that this wholesome provision for household peace should also be allowed them: and must this be denied to christians? O perverseness! that the law should be made more provident of peace-making than the gospel! that the gospel should be put to beg a most necessary help of mercy from the law, but must not have it; and that to grind in the mill of an undelighted and servile copulation, must be the only forced work of a christian marriage, oft-times with such a yoke-fellow, from whom both love and peace, both nature and religion mourns to be separated. I cannot therefore be so diffident, as not securely to conclude, that he who can receive nothing of the most important helps in marriage, being thereby disabled to return that duty which is his, with a clear and hearty countenance, and thus continues to grieve whom he would not, and is no less grieved; that man ought even for love's sake and peace to move divorce upon good and liberal conditions to the divorced. And it is a less breach of wedlock to part with wife and quiet consent betimes, than still to foil and prophane that mystery of joy and union with a polluting sadness and perpetual distemper: for it is not the outward continuing of marriage that keeps whole that covenant, but whatsoever does most according to peace and love, whether in marriage or in divorce, he it is that breaks marriage least; it being so often written, that "Love only is the fulfilling of every commandment."

C H A P. VII.

The fifth reason, that nothing more hinders and disturbs the whole life of a christian, than a matrimony found to be incurably unfit, and doth the same in effect that an idolatrous match.

Fifthly, As those priests of old were not to be long in sorrow, or if they were, they could not rightly execute their function; so every true christian in a higher order of priesthood is a person dedicate to joy and peace, offering himself a lively sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and there is no christian duty that is not to be seasoned and set off with cheerfulness; which in a thousand outward and intermitting crosses may yet be done well, as in this vale of tears: but in such a bosom-affliction as this, crushing the very foundation of his inmost nature, when he shall be forced to love against a possibility, and to use a dissimulation against his soul in the perpetual and ceaseless duties of a husband; doubtless his whole duty of serving God must needs be blurred and tainted with a sad unpreparedness and dejection of spirit wherein God has no delight. Who sees not therefore how much more christianity it would be to break by divorce, that which is more broken by undue and forcible keeping, rather than “to cover the altar of the Lord with continual tears, so that he regardeth not the offering any more,” rather than that the whole worship of a christian man’s life should languish and fade away beneath the weight of an immeasurable grief and discouragement? And because some think the children of a second matrimony succeeding a divorce, would not be a holy seed, it hindered not the Jews from being so; and why should we not think them more holy than the off-spring of a former ill-twisted wedlock, begotten only out of a bestial necessity, without any true love or contentment, or joy to their parents? So that in some sense we may call them the “children of wrath” and anguish, which will as little conduce to their sanctifying, as if they had been bastards: for nothing more than disturbance of mind suspends us from approaching to God; such a disturbance especially, as both assaults our faith and trust in God’s providence, and ends, if there be not a miracle of virtue on either side, not only in bitterness and wrath, the canker of devotion, but in a desperate and vicious carelessness, when he sees himself without fault of his, trained by a deceitful bait into a snare of misery, betrayed by an alluring ordinance, and then made the thrall of heaviness and discomfort by an undivorcing law of God, as he erroneously thinks, but of man’s iniquity, as the truth is: for that God prefers the free and chearful worship of a christian, before the grievance and exacted observance of an unhappy marriage; besides that the general maxims of religion assure us, will be more manifest by drawing a parallel argument from the ground of divorcing an idolatress, which was, lest he should alienate his heart from the true worship of God: and what difference is there whether she pervert him to superstition by her enticing forcery, or disinable him in the whole service of God through the disturbance of her unhelpful and unfit society; and so drive him at last, through murmuring and despair, to thoughts of atheism? Neither doth it lessen the cause of separating, in that the one willingly allures him from the faith, the other perhaps unwillingly drives him; for in the account of God it comes all to one, that the wife looses him a servant: and therefore by all the united force of the Decalogue she ought to be disbanded, unless we must set marriage above God and Charity, which is the doctrine of devils, no less than forbidding to marry.

C H A P. VIII.

That an idolatrous heretic ought to be divorced, after a convenient space given to hope of conversion. That place of 1 Cor. vii. restored from a two-fold erroneous exposition: and that the common expositors flatly contradict the moral law.

AND here by the way, to illustrate the whole question of divorce, ere this treatise end, I shall not be loth to spend a few lines in hope to give a full resolve of that which is yet so much controverted; whether an idolatrous heretic ought to be divorced. To the resolving whereof we must first know, that the Jews were commanded to divorce an unbelieving Gentile for two causes: First, because all other nations, especially the Canaanites, were to them unclean. Secondly, to avoid seducement. That other nations were to the Jews impure, even to the separating of Marriage, will appear out of Exod. xxxiv. 16. Deut vii. 3, 6. compared with Ezra ix. 2. also chap. x. 10, 11. Nehem. xiii. 30. This was the ground of that doubt raised among the Corinthians by some of the circumcision; whether an unbeliever were not still to be counted an unclean thing, so as that they ought to divorce from such a person. This doubt of theirs St. Paul removes by an evangelical reason, having respect to that vision of St. Peter, wherein the distinction of clean and unclean being abolished, all living creatures were sanctified to a pure and Christian use, and mankind especially, now invited by a general call to the covenant of grace. Therefore saith St. Paul, "The unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband;" that is, made pure and lawful to his use, so that he need not put her away for fear lest her unbelief should defile him; but that if he found her love still towards him, he might rather hope to win her. The second reason of that divorce was to avoid seducement, as is proved by comparing those two places of the law, to that which Ezra and Nehemiah did by divine warrant in compelling the Jews to forego their wives. And this reason is moral and perpetual in the rule of Christian faith without evasion; therefore saith the apostle, 2 Cor. vi. "Mis-yoke not together with infidels," which is interpreted of marriage in the first place. And although the former legal pollution be now done off, yet there is a spiritual contagion in idolatry as much to be shunned; and though seducement were not to be feared, yet where there is no hope of converting, there always ought to be a certain religious averfation and abhorring, which can no way sort with marriage: Therefore saith St. Paul, "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? what communion hath light with darkness? what concord hath Christ with Belial? what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" And in the next verse but one he moralizes, and makes us liable to that command of Isaiah; "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord; touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive ye." And this command thus gospellized to us, hath the same force with that whereon Ezra grounded the pious necessity of divorcing. Neither had he other commission for what he did, than such a general command in Deut. as this, nay not so direct; for he is bid there not to marry, but not bid to divorce, and yet we see with what a zeal and confidence he was the author of a general divorce between the faithful and the unfaithful seed. The Gospel is more plainly on his side, according to three of the Evangelists, than the words of the law; for where the case of divorce is handled with such severity, as was fittest to aggravate the fault of unbounded licence; yet still in the same chapter, when it comes into question afterwards, whether any civil respect, or natural relation which is dearest, may be our plea to divide, or hinder or but delay our duty to religion, we hear it determined that father, and mother, and wife also, is not only to be hated, but forsaken,
if

if we mean to inherit the great reward there promised. Nor will it suffice to be put off by saying, we must forsake them only by not consenting or not complying with them, for that were to be done, and roundly too, though being of the same faith, they should but seek out of a fleshly tenderness to weaken our Christian fortitude with worldly persuasions, or but to unsettle our constancy with timorous and softening suggestions; as we may read with what a vehemence Job, the patientest of men, rejected the desperate counsels of his wife; and Moses, the meekest, being thoroughly offended with the prophane speeches of Zippora, sent her back to her father. But if they shall perpetually at our elbow seduce us from the true worship of God, or defile and daily scandalize our conscience by their hopeless continuance in misbelief; then even in the due progress of reason, and that ever-equal proportion which justice proceeds by, it cannot be imagined that this cited place commands less than a total and final separation from such an adherent; at least that no force should be used to keep them together: while we remember that God commanded Abraham to send away his irreligious wife and her son for the offences which they gave in a pious family. And it may be guessed that David for the like cause disposed of Michal in such a sort, as little differed from a dismissal. Therefore against reiterated scandals and seducements, which never cease, much more can no other remedy or retirement be found but absolute departure. For what kind of matrimony can that remain to be, what one duty between such can be performed as it should be from the heart, when their thoughts and spirits fly asunder as far as heaven from hell; especially if the time that hope should send forth her expected blossoms, be past in vain? It will easily be true, that a father or a brother may be hated zealously, and loved civilly or naturally; for those duties may be performed at distance, and do admit of any long absence: but how the peace and perpetual cohabitation of marriage can be kept, how that benevolent and intimate communion of body can be held with one that must be hated with a most operative hatred, must be forsaken and yet continually dwelt with and accompanied; he who can distinguish, hath the gift of an affection very oddly divided and contrived: while others both just and wise, and Solomon among the rest, if they may not hate and forsake as Moses enjoins, and the gospel imports, will find it impossible not to love otherwise than will sort with the love of God, whose jealousy brooks no corrival. And whether is more likely, that Christ bidding to forsake wife for religion, meant it by divorce as Moses meant it, whose law grounded on moral reason, was both his office and his essence to maintain; or that he should bring a new morality into religion, not only new, but contrary to an unchangeable command, and dangerously derogating from our love and worship of God? As if when Moses had bid divorce absolutely, and Christ had said, hate and forsake, and his Apostle had said, no communication with Christ and Belial; yet that Christ after all this could be understood to say, divorce not, no not for religion, seduce, or seduce not. What mighty and invisible remora is this in matrimony, able to demur and to condemn all the divorcive engines in heaven or earth! both which may now pass away, if this be true; for more than many jots or tittles, a whole moral law is abolished. But if we dare believe it is not, then in the method of religion, and to save the honour and dignity of our faith, we are to retreat and gather up ourselves from the observance of an inferior and civil ordinance, to the strict maintaining of a general and religious command, which is written, "Thou shalt make no covenant with them," Deut. vii. 2, 3: and that covenant which cannot be lawfully made, we have directions and examples lawfully to dissolve. Also 2 Chron. ii. 19. "Shouldest thou love them that hate the Lord?" No, doubtless: for there is a certain scale of duties, there is a certain hierarchy of upper and lower commands, which for want of studying in right order, all the world is in confusion.

Upon these principles I answer, that a right believer ought to divorce an idolatrous heretic, unless upon better hopes: however, that it is in the believer's choice to divorce or not.

The former part will be manifest thus; first, that an apostate idolater, whether husband or wife seducing, was to die by the decree of God, Deut. xiii. 6, 9. that marriage therefore God himself disjoins: for others born idolaters, the moral reason of their dangerous keeping, and the incommunicable antagony that is between Christ and Belial, will be sufficient to enforce the commandment of those two inspired reformers Ezra and Nehemiah, to put an idolater away as well under the gospel.

The latter part, that altho' there be no seducement feared, yet if there be no hope given, the divorce is lawful, will appear by this; that idolatrous marriage is still hateful to God, therefore still it may be divorced by the pattern of that warrant that Ezra had, and by the same everlasting reason: Neither can any man give an account wherefore, if those whom God joins no man can separate, it should not follow, that whom he joins not, but hates to join, those men ought to separate. But saith the lawyer, "That which ought not to have been done, once done, avails. I answer, "this is but a crotchet of the law, but that brought against it is plain Scripture." As for what Christ spake concerning divorce, it is confessed by all knowing men, he meant only between them of the same faith. But what shall we say then to St. Paul, who seems to bid us not divorce an infidel willing to stay? We may safely say thus, that wrong collections have been hitherto made out of those words by modern divines. His drift, as was heard before, is plain; not to command our stay in marriage with an infidel, that had been a flat renouncing of the religious and moral law; but to inform the Corinthians that the body of an unbeliever was not defiling, if his desire to live in Christian wedlock shewed any likelihood that his heart was opening to the faith; and therefore advises to forbear departure so long till nothing have been neglected to set forward a conversion: this I say he advises, and that with certain cautions not commands, if we can take up so much credit for him, as to get him believ'd upon his own word: for what is this else but his counsel in a thing indifferent, "to the rest speak I, not the Lord?" for tho' it be true that the Lord never spake it, yet from St. Paul's mouth we should have took it as a command, had not himself forewarned us, and disclaimed; which notwithstanding if we shall still avouch to be a command, he palpably denying it, this is not to expound St. Paul, but to outface him. Neither doth it follow, that the Apostle may interpose his judgment in a case of Christian liberty, without the guilt of adding to God's word. How do we know marriage or single life to be of choice, but by such like words as these, "I speak this by permission, not of commandment; I have no command of the Lord, yet I give my judgment." Why shall not the like words have leave to signify a freedom in this our present question, though Beza deny? Neither is the Scripture hereby less inspired, because St. Paul confesses to have written therein what he had not of command: for we grant that the spirit of God led him thus to express himself to Christian prudence, in a matter which God thought best to leave uncommanded. Beza therefore must be warily read, when he taxes St. Austin of Blasphemy, for holding that St. Paul spake here as of a thing indifferent. But if it must be a command, I shall yet the more evince it to be a command that we should herein be left free; and that out of the Greek word used in the 12 v. which instructs us plainly, there must be a joint assent and good liking on both sides: he that will not deprave the text must thus render it; "If a brother have an unbelieving wife, and she join in consent to dwell with him" (which cannot utter less to us than a mutual agreement) let him not put her away from the mere surmise of judaical uncleanness: and the reason follows, for the body of an infidel is not polluted, neither to benevolence, nor to procreation. Moreover, this note of mutual complacency forbids all offer of seducement, which to a person of zeal cannot be attempted without great offence: if therefore seducement be feared, this place hinders not divorce. Another caution was put in this supposed command, of not bringing the believer into 'bondage' hereby, which doubtless might prove extreme, if Christian liberty and conscience were left to the humour of a pagan staying at pleasure to play with, and to vex and wound with a thousand scandals and burdens, above strength to bear: If therefore the

conceived hope of gaining a soul come to nothing, then charity commands that the believer be not wearied out with endless waiting under many grievances sore to his spirit; but that respect be had rather to the present suffering of a true Christian, than the uncertain winning of an obdured heretic. The counsel we have from St. Paul to hope, cannot countermand the moral and evangelic charge we have from God to fear seducement, to separate from the misbeliever, the unclean, the obdurate. The Apostle wisheth us to hope, but does not send us a wool-gathering after vain hope; he saith, "How knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?" that is, till he try all due means, and set some reasonable time to himself, after which he may give over washing an Ethiop, if he will hear the advice of the gospel; "Cast not pearls before swine," saith Christ himself. "Let him be to thee as a heathen. Shake the dust off thy feet." If this be not enough, "hate and forsake," what relation soever. And this also that follows must appertain to the precept, "Let every man wherein he is called, therein abide with God," v. 24. that is, so walking in his inferior calling of marriage, as not by dangerous subjection to that ordinance, to hinder and disturb the higher calling of his christianity. Last, and never too oft remembred, whether this be a command, or an advice, we must look that it be so understood as not to contradict the least point of moral religion that God hath formerly commanded; otherwise what do we but set the moral law and the gospel at civil war together? and who then shall be able to serve these two masters!

C H A P. IX

That adultery is not the greatest breach of matrimony: that there may be other violations as great.

NOW whether idolatry or adultery be the greatest violation of marriage, if any demand, let him thus consider; that among Christian writers touching matrimony, there be three chief ends thereof agreed on: godly society, next civil, and thirdly, that of the marriage-bed. Of these the first in name to be the highest and most excellent, no baptized man can deny, nor that idolatry smites directly against this prime end; nor that such as the violated end is, such is the violation: but he who affirms adultery to be the highest breach, affirms the bed to be the highest of marriage, which is in truth a gross and boorish opinion, how common soever; as far from the countenance of Scripture, as from the sight of all clean philosophy, or civil nature. And out of question the chearful help that may be in marriage toward sanctity of life, is the purest, and so the noblest end of that contract: but if the particular of each person be considered, then of those three ends which God appointed, that to him is greatest which is most necessary; and marriage is then most broken to him, when he utterly wants the fruition of that which he most sought therein, whether it were religious, civil, or corporal society. Of which wants to do him right by divorce only for the last and meanest, is a perverse injury, and the pretended reason of it as frigid as frigidity itself, which the Code and Canon are only sensible of. Thus much of this controversy. I now return to the former argument. And having shewn that disproportion, contrariety or numbness of mind may justly be divorced, by proving already the prohibition thereof opposes the express end of God's institution, suffers not marriage to satisfy that intellectual and innocent desire which God himself kindled in man to be the bond of wedlock, but only to remedy a sublunary and bestial burning, which frugal diet, without marriage, would easily chasten. Next, that it drives many to transgress the conjugal bed, while the soul wanders after that satisfaction which it had hope to find at home, but hath missed; or else it sits repining, even to Atheism, finding itself hardly dealt with, but misdeeming the cause to be in God's law, which is
in

in man's unrighteous ignorance. I have shewn also how it unties the inward knot of marriage, which is peace and love (if that can be untied which was never knit) while it aims to keep fast the outward formality : how it lets perish the Christian man, to compel impossibly the married man.

C H A P. X.

The sixth reason of this law ; that to prohibit divorce sought for natural cases, is against nature.

THE sixth place declares this prohibition to be as respectless of human nature, as it is of religion, and therefore is not of God. He teaches, that an unlawful marriage may be lawfully divorced : And that those who having thoroughly discerned each other's disposition, which oft-times cannot be till after matrimony, shall then find a powerful reluctance and recoil of nature on either side, blasting all the content of their mutual society, that such persons are not lawfully married, (to use the Apostle's words) " Say I these things as a man, or saith not the law also the same ? for it is written, Deut. xxii. Thou shalt not sow thy vineyard with different seeds, lest thou defile both. Thou shalt not plow with an ox and an ass together ;" and the like. I follow the pattern of St. Paul's reasoning ; " Doth God care for asses and oxen," how ill they yoke together, " or is it not said altogether for our sakes ? for our sakes no doubt this is written." Yea the Apostle himself, in the forecited 2 Cor. vi. 14. alludes from that place of Deut. to forbid misyoking marriage, as by the Greek word is evident ; though he instance but in one example of mismatching with an infidel, yet next to that, what can be a fouler incongruity, a greater violence to the reverend secret of nature, than to force a mixture of minds that cannot unite, and to sow the sorrow of man's nativity with seed of two incoherent and incombining dispositions ? which act being kindly and voluntary, as it ought, the Apostle in the language he wrote called *Eunoia*, and the Latins, *Benevolence*, intimating the original thereof to be in the understanding, and the will ; if not, surely there is nothing which might more properly be called a *malevolence* rather ; and is the most injurious and unnatural tribute that can be extorted from a person endued with reason, to be made pay out the best substance of his body, and of his soul too, as some think, when either for just and powerful causes he cannot like, or from unequal causes finds not recompence. And that there is a hidden efficacy of love and hatred in man as well as in other kinds, not moral, but natural, which though not always in the choice, yet in the success of marriage will ever be most predominant ; besides daily experience, the author of Ecclesiasticus, whose wisdom hath set him next the Bible, acknowledges, xiii. 16. " A man, saith he, will cleave to his like." But what might be the cause, whether each one's allotted Genius or proper star, or whether the * supernal influence of schemes and angular aspects, or this elemental Crasis here below ; whether all these jointly or singly meeting friendly, or unfriendly in either party, I dare not, with the men I am like to clash, appear so much a philosopher as to conjecture. The ancient proverb in Homer less abstruse, entitles this work of leading each like person to his like, peculiarly to God himself : which is plain enough also by his naming of a meet or like help in the first espousal instituted ; and that every woman is meet for every man, none so absurd as to affirm. Seeing then there is a two-fold seminary, or stock in nature, from whence are derived the issues of love and hatred, distinctly flowing through the whole mass of created things, and that God's doing ever is to bring the due likenesses and harmonies of his works together, except when out of two contraries met to their own destruction, he moulds a third existence ; and that

* The first edition has, *supernatural*.

is error, or some evil angel which either blindly or maliciously hath drawn together, in two persons ill embarked in wedlock, the sleeping discords and enmities of nature, lulled on purpose with some false bait, that they may wake to agony and strife, later than prevention could have wished, if from the bent of just and honest intentions beginning what was begun and so continuing, all that is equal, all that is fair and possible hath been tried, and no accommodation likely to succeed; what folly is it still to stand combating and battering against invincible causes and effects, with evil upon evil, till either the best of our days be lingered out, or ended with some speeding sorrow? The wise Ecclesiasticus advises rather, xxxvii. 27. "My son prove thy soul in thy life, see what is evil for it, and give not that unto it." Reason he had to say so; for if the noisomeness or disfigurement of body can soon destroy the sympathy of mind to wedlock duties, much more will the annoyance and trouble of mind infuse itself into all the faculties and acts of the body, to render them invalid, unkindly, and even unholy against the fundamental law-book of nature, which Moses never thwarts, but reverences: therefore he commands us to force nothing against sympathy or natural order, no not upon the most abject creatures; to shew that such an indignity cannot be offered to man without an impious crime. And certainly those divine meditating words of finding out a meet and like help to man, have in them a consideration of more than the indefinite likeness of womanhood; nor are they to be made waste-paper on, for the dulness of canon-divinity: no, nor those other allegoric precepts of beneficence fetched out of the closet of nature, to teach us goodness and compassion in not compelling together unmatchable societies; or if they meet through mischance, by all consequence to disjoin them, as God and nature signifies, and lectures to us not only by those recited decrees, but even by the first and last of all his visible works; when by his divorcing command the world first rose out of Chaos, nor can be renewed again out of confusion, but by the separating of unmeet comforts.

C H A P. XI.

The seventh reason, that sometimes continuance in marriage may be evidently the shortning or endangering of life to either party; both law and divinity concluding, that life is to be preferred before marriage, the intended solace of life.

SEventhly, the canon-law and divines consent, that if either party be found contriving against another's life, they may be severed by divorce: for a sin against the life of marriage, is greater than a sin against the bed; the one destroys, the other but defiles. The same may be said touching those persons who being of a pensive nature and course of life, have summed up all their solace in that free and lightsome conversation which God and man intends in marriage; whereof when they see themselves deprived by meeting an unsociable consort, they oft-times resent one another's mistake so deeply, that long it is not ere grief end one of them. When therefore this danger is foreseen, that the life is in peril by living together, what matter is it whether helpless grief or wilful practice be the cause? This is certain, that the preservation of life is more worth than the compulsory keeping of marriage; and it is no less than cruelty to force a man to remain in that state as the solace of his life, which he and his friends know will be either the undoing or the disheartning of his life. And what is life without the vigour and spiritual exercise of life? how can it be useful either to private or public employment? Shall it therefore be quite dejected, tho' never so valuable, and left to moulder away in heaviness, for the superstitious and impossible performance of an ill-driven bargain? Nothing more invio-

lable than vows made to God ; yet we read in Numbers, that if a wife had made such a vow, the mere will and authority of her husband might break it : how much more then may he break the error of his own bonds with an unfit and mistaken wife, to the saving of his welfare, his life, yea his faith and virtue, from the hazard of over-strong temptations ? For if man be lord of the sabbath, to the curing of a fever, can he be less than lord of marriage in such important causes as these ?

C H A P. XII.

The eighth reason, It is probable or rather certain, that every one who happens to marry, hath not the calling ; and therefore upon unfitness found and considered, force ought not to be used.

Eighthly, It is most sure that some even of those who are not plainly defective in body, yet are destitute of all other marriageable gifts, and consequently have not the calling to marry, unless nothing be requisite thereto but a mere instrumental body ; which to affirm, is to that unanimous covenant a reproach : yet it is as sure that many such, not of their own desire, but by the persuasion of friends, or not knowing themselves, do often enter into wedlock ; where finding the difference at length between the duties of a married life, and the gifts of a single life, what unfitness of mind, what wearisomness, scruples and doubts to an incredible offence and displeasure are like to follow between, may be soon imagined ; whom thus to shut up, and immure, and shut up together, the one with a mischosen mate, the other in a mistaken calling, is not a course that Christian wisdom and tenderness ought to use. As for the custom that some parents and guardians have of forcing marriages, it will be better to say nothing of such a savage inhumanity, but only thus ; that the law which gives not all freedom of divorce to any creature endued with reason so assassinated, is next in cruelty.

C H A P. XIII.

The ninth reason ; because marriage is not a mere carnal coition, but a human society : where that cannot reasonably be had, there can be no true matrimony. Marriage compared with all other covenants and vows warrantably broken for the good of man. Marriage the Papists sacrament, and unfit marriage the Protestants idol.

Ninthly, I suppose it will be allowed us that marriage is a human society, and that all human society must proceed from the mind rather than the body, else it would be but a kind of animal or beastish meeting : if the mind therefore cannot have that due company by marriage that it may reasonably and humanly desire, that marriage can be no human society, but a certain formality ; or gilding over of little better than a brutish congress, and so in very wisdom and pureness to be dissolved.

But marriage is more than human, "the covenant of God," Prov. ii. 17. therefore man cannot dissolve it. I answer, if it be more than human, so much the more it argues the chief society thereof to be in the soul rather than in the body, and the greatest breach thereof

thereof to be unfitness of mind rather than defect of body : for the body can have least affinity in a covenant more than human, so that the reason of dissolving holds good the rather. Again, I answer, that the sabbath is a higher institution, a command of the first table, for the breach whereof God hath far more and oftener testified his anger, than for divorces, which from Moses to Malachy he never took displeasure at, nor then neither if we mark the text ; and yet as oft as the good of man is concerned, he not only permits, but commands to break the sabbath. What covenant more contracted with God, and less in man's power, than the vow which hath once past his lips ? yet if it be found rash, if offensive, if unfruitful either to God's glory or the good of man, our doctrine forces not error and unwillingness irksomely to keep it, but counsels wisdom and better thoughts boldly to break it ; therefore to enjoin the indissoluble keeping of a marriage found unfit against the good of man both soul and body, as hath been evidenced, is to make an idol of marriage, to advance it above the worship of God and the good of man, to make it a transcendent command, above both the second and first table ; which is a most prodigious doctrine.

Next, whereas they cite out of the Proverbs, that it is the Covenant of God, and therefore more than human, that consequence is manifestly false : for so the covenant which Zedekiah made with the infidel king of Babel, is called the Covenant of God, Ezek. xvii. 19. which would be strange to hear counted more than a human covenant. So every covenant between man and man, bound by oath, may be called the covenant of God, because God therein is attested. So of marriage he is the author and the witness ; yet hence will not follow any divine striction more than what is subordinate to the glory of God, and the main good of either party : for as the glory of God and their esteemed fitness one for the other, was the motive which led them both at first to think without other revelation that God had joined them together ; so when it shall be found by their apparent unfitness, that their continuing to be man and wife is against the glory of God and their mutual happiness, it may assure them that God never joined them ; who hath revealed his gracious will not to set the ordinance above the man for whom it was ordained ; not to canonize marriage either as a tyranness or a goddess over the enfranchised life and soul of man : For wherein can God delight, wherein be worshipped, wherein be glorified by the forcible continuing of an improper and ill-yoking couple ? He that loved not to see the disparity of several cattle at the plow, cannot be pleased with vast unmeetness in marriage. Where can be the peace and love which must invite God to such a house ? May it not be feared that the not divorcing of such a helpless disagreement, will be the divorcing of God finally from such a place ? But it is a trial of our patience, say they : I grant it ; but which of Job's afflictions were sent him with that law, that he might not use means to remove any of them if he could ? And what if it subvert our patience and our faith too ? Who shall answer for the perishing of all those souls, perishing by stubborn expositions of particular and inferior precepts against the general and supreme rule of charity ? They dare not affirm that marriage is either a sacrament or a mystery, though all those sacred things give place to man ; and yet they invest it with such an awful sanctity, and give it such adamantine chains to bind with, as if it were to be worshipped like some Indian deity, when it can confer no blessing upon us, but works more and more to our misery. To such teachers the saying of St. Peter at the council of Jerusalem will do well to be applied : " Why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the necks of " christian men, which neither the Jews, God's ancient people, " nor we are able to bear ; " and nothing but unwary expounding hath brought upon us ?

C H A P. XIV.

Considerations concerning Familism, Antinomianism; and why it may be thought that such opinions may proceed from the undue restraint of some just liberty, than which no greater cause to condemn discipline.

TO these considerations this also may be added as no improbable conjecture, seeing that sort of men who follow Anabaptism, Familism, Antinomianism, and other fanatic dreams (if we understand them not amiss) be such most commonly as are by nature addicted to religion, of life also not debauched, and that their opinions having full swing, do end in satisfaction of the flesh; it may be come with reason into the thoughts of a wise man, whether all this proceed not partly, if not chiefly, from the restraint of some lawful liberty which ought to be given men, and is denied them? As by physic we learn in menstruous bodies, where nature's current hath been stopt, that the suffocation and upward forcing of some lower part, affects the head and inward sense with dotage and idle fancies. And on the other hand, whether the rest of vulgar men not so religiously professing, do not give themselves much the more to whoredom and adulteries, loving the corrupt and venial discipline of clergy-courts, but hating to hear of perfect reformation; whenas they foresee that then fornication shall be austere censured, adultery punished; and marriage the appointed refuge of nature, tho' it hap to be never so incongruous and displeasing, must yet of force be worne out, when it can be to no other purpose but of strife and hatred, a thing odious to God? This may be worth the study of skilful men in theology, and the reason of things. And lastly, to examine whether some undue and ill-grounded strictness upon the blameless nature of man, be not the cause in those places where already reformation is, that the discipline of the Church, so often, and so unavoidably broken, is brought into contempt and derision? And if it be thus, let those who are still bent to hold this obstinate Literality, so prepare themselves, as to share in the account for all these transgressions, when it shall be demanded at the last day, by one who will scan and shift things with more than a literal wisdom of equity: for if these reasons be duly pondered, and that the gospel is more jealous of laying on excessive burdens than ever the law was, lest the soul of a Christian, which is inestimable, should be over-tempted and cast away; considering also that many properties of nature, which the power of regeneration itself never alters, may cause dislike of conversing, even between the most sanctified; which continually grating in harsh tune together, may breed some jar and discord, and that end in rancour and strife, a thing so opposite both to marriage and to Christianity, it would perhaps be less scandal to divorce a natural disparity, than to link violently together an unchristian dissension, committing two insnared souls inevitably to kindle one another, not with the fire of love, but with a hatred irreconcilable; who, were they dissevered, would be straight friends in any other relation. But if an alphabetical servility must be still urged, it may so fall out, that the true Church may unwittingly use as much cruelty in forbidding to divorce, as the Church of antichrist doth willfully in forbidding to marry.

B O O K II.

C H A P. I.

The ordinance of sabbath and marriage compared. Hyperbole no unfrequent figure in the gospel. Excess cured by contrary excess. Christ neither did nor could abrogate the law of divorce, but only relieve the abuse thereof.

Hitherto the position undertaken hath been declared, and proved by a law of God, that law proved to be moral, and unabolishable, for many reasons equal, honest, charitable, just, annexed thereto. It follows now, that those places of Scripture which have a seeming to revoke the prudence of Moses, or rather that merciful decree of God, be forthwith explained and reconciled. For what are all these reasonings worth, will some reply, whenas the words of Christ are plainly against all divorce, "except in case of fornication?" To whom he whose mind were to answer no more but this, "except also in case of charity," might safely appeal to the more plain words of Christ in defence of so excepting. "Thou shalt do no manner of work," saith the commandment of the sabbath. Yes, saith Christ, works of charity. And shall we be more severe in paraphrasing the considerate and tender gospel, than he was in expounding the rigid and peremptory law? What was ever in all appearance less made for man, and more for God alone, than the sabbath? yet when the good of man comes into the scales, we hear that voice of infinite goodness and benignity, that "Sabbath was made for man, not man for sabbath." What thing ever was more made for man alone and less for God than marriage? And shall we load it with a cruel and senseless bondage utterly against both the good of man, and the glory of God? Let whoso will now listen, I want neither pall nor mitre, I stay neither for ordination nor induction; but in the firm faith of a knowing Christian, which is the best and truest endowment of the keys, I pronounce, the man who shall bind so cruelly a good and gracious ordinance of God, hath not in that the spirit of Christ. Yet that every text of Scripture seeming opposite may be attended with a due exposition, this other part ensues, and makes account to find no slender arguments for this assertion, out of those very Scriptures, which are commonly urged against it.

First therefore let us remember, as a thing not to be denied, that all places of Scripture wherein just reason of doubt arises from the letter, are to be expounded by considering upon what occasion every thing is set down, and by comparing other texts. The occasion which induced our Saviour to speak of divorce, was either to convince the extravagance of the Pharisees in that point, or to give a sharp and vehement answer to a tempting question. And in such cases that we are not to repose all upon the literal terms of so many words, many instances will teach us: Wherein we may plainly discover how Christ meant not to be taken word for word, but like a wise physician, administering one excess against another, to reduce us to a permixt; where they were too remiss, he saw it needful to seem most severe: in one place he censures an unchaste look to be adultery already committed; another time he passes over actual adultery with less reproof than for an unchaste look; not so heavily condemning secret weakness, as open malice: So here he may be justly thought to have given this rigid sentence against divorce, not to cut off all remedy from a good man who finds himself consuming away in a disconsolate and uninjoined matrimony, but to lay a bridle upon the bold abuses of those over-weening Rabbies; which

which he could not more effectually do, than by a counterway of restraint curbing their wild exorbitance almost in the other extreme; as when we bow things the contrary way, to make them come to their natural straitness. And that this was the only intention of Christ is most evident, if we attend but to his own words and protestation made in the same sermon, not many verses before he treats of divorcing, that he came not to abrogate from the law 'one jot or tittle,' and denounce against them that shall so teach.

But St. Luke the verse immediately before-going that of divorce, inserts the same caveat, as if the latter could not be understood without the former; and as a witness to produce against this our wilful mistake of abrogating, which must needs confirm us that whatever else in the political law of more special relation to the Jews might cease to us; yet that of those precepts concerning divorce, not one of them was repealed by the doctrine of Christ, unless we have vowed not to believe his own cautious and immediate profession: for if these our Saviour's words inveigh against all divorce, and condemn it as adultery, except it be for adultery, and be not rather understood against the abuse of those divorces permitted in the law, then is that law of Moses, Deut. xxiv. 1. not only repealed and wholly annulled against the promise of Christ, and his known profession not to meddle in matters judicial; but that which is more strange, the very substance and purpose of that law is contradicted and convinced both of injustice and impurity, as having authorized and maintained legal adultery by statute. Moses also cannot scape to be guilty of unequal and unwise decrees, punishing one act of secret adultery by death, and permitting a whole life of open adultery by law. And albeit lawyers write that some political edicts, though not approved, are yet allowed to the scum of the people, and the necessity of the times; these excuses have but a weak pulse: For first, we read, not that the scoundrel people, but the choicest, the wisest, the holiest of that nation have frequently used these laws, or such as these, in the best and holiest times. Secondly, be it yielded, that in matters not very bad or impure, a human law-giver may slacken something of that which is exactly good, to the disposition of the people and the times: but if the perfect, the pure, the righteous law of God, (for so are all his statutes and his judgments,) be found to have allowed smoothly, without any certain reprehension, that which Christ afterward declares to be adultery, how can we free this law from the horrible inditement of being both impure, unjust, and fallacious?

C H A P. II.

How divorce was permitted for hardness of heart, cannot be understood by the common exposition. That the law cannot permit, much less enact a permission of sin.

N Either will it serve to say this was permitted for the hardness of their hearts, in that sense as it is usually explained: for the law were then but a corrupt and erroneous school-master, teaching us to dash against a vital maxim of religion, by doing foul evil in hope of some certain good.

This only text is not to be matched again throughout the whole scripture, whereby God in his perfect law should seem to have granted to the hard hearts of his holy people under his own hand, a civil immunity and free charter to live and die in a long successive adultery, under a covenant of works, till the Messiah, and then that indulgent permission to be strictly denied by a covenant of grace; besides the incoherence of such a doctrine, cannot, must not be thus interpreted, to the raising of a paradox never known till

till then, only hanging by the twined thread of one doubtful scripture, against so many other rules and leading principles of religion, of justice, and purity of life. For what could be granted more either to the fear, or to the lust of any tyrant or politician, than this authority of Moses thus expounded; which opens him a way at will to damm up justice, and not only to admit of any Romish or Austrian dispenses, but to enact a statute of that which he dares not seem to approve, even to legitimate vice, to make sin itself, the ever alien and vassal sin, a free citizen of the commonwealth, pretending only these or these plausible reasons? And well he might, all the while that Moses shall be alledged to have done as much without shewing any reason at all. Yet this could not enter into the heart of David, Psal. xciv. 20. how any such authority as endeavours to 'fashion wickedness by a law,' should derive itself from God. And Isaiah lays 'woe upon them that decree unrighteous decrees,' chap. x. 1. Now which of these two is the better law-giver, and which deserves most a woe, he that gives out an edict singly unjust, or he that confirms to generations a fixed and unmolested impunity of that which is not only held to be unjust, but also unclean, and both in a high degree; not only as they themselves affirm, an injurious expulsion of one wife, but also an unclean freedom by more than a patent to wed another adulterously? How can we therefore with safety thus dangerously confine the free simplicity of our Saviour's meaning to that which merely amounts from so many letters, whenas it can consist neither with his former and cautionary words, nor with other more pure and holy principles, nor finally with the scope of charity, commanding by his express commission in a higher strain. But all rather of necessity must be understood as only against the abuse of that wise and ingenuous liberty which Moses gave, and to terrify a roving conscience from sinning under that pretext.

C H A P. III.

That to allow Sin by law, is against the nature of law, the end of the law-giver, and the good of the people. Impossible therefore in the law of God. That it makes God the author of sin more than any thing objected by the Jesuits or Arminians against predestination.

BUT let us yet further examine upon what consideration a law of licence could be thus given to a holy people for the hardness of heart. I suppose all will answer, that for some good end or other. But here the contrary shall be proved. First, that many ill effects, but no good end of such a sufferance can be shewn; next, that a thing unlawful can for no good end whatever be either done or allowed by a positive law. If there were any good end aimed at, that end was then good either to the law or to the law-giver licensing; or as to the person licensed. That it could not be the end of the law, whether moral or judicial, to license a sin, I prove easily out of Rom. v. 20. 'The law entered, that the offence might abound,' that is, that sin might be made abundantly manifest to be heinous and displeasing to God, that so his offered grace might be the more esteemed. Now if the law, instead of aggravating and terrifying sin, shall give out licence, it foils itself, and turns recreant from its own end: it forestalls the pure grace of Christ, which is through righteousness, with impure indulgences, which are through sin. And instead of discovering sin, for 'by the law is the knowledge thereof,' saith St. Paul, and that by certain and true light for men to walk in safety, it holds out false
and

and dazzling fires to stumble men; or like those miserable flies to run into with delight and be burnt: for how many souls might easily think that to be lawful which the law and magistrate allowed them? Again, we read 1 Tim. i. 5. 'The end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good Conscience, and of faith unfeigned.' But never could that be charity to allow a people what they could not use with a pure heart, but with conscience and faith both deceived, or else despised. The more particular end of the judicial law is set forth to us clearly Rom. xiii. That God hath given to that law 'a sword not in vain, but to be a terror to evil works, a revenge to execute wrath upon him that doth evil.' If this terrible commission should but forbear to punish wickedness, were it other to be accounted than partial and unjust? but if it begin to write indulgence to vulgar uncleanness, can it do more to corrupt and shame the end of its own being? Lastly, if the law allow sin, it enters into a kind of covenant with sin; and if it do, there is not a greater sinner in the world than the law itself. The law, to use an allegory something different from that in Philo-Judæus concerning Amalek, though haply more significant, the law is the Israelite, and hath this absolute charge given it, Deut. xxv. 'To blot out the memory of sin, the Amalekite, from under heaven, not to forget it.' Again, the law is the Israelite, and hath this express repeated command 'to make no covenant with sin, the Canaanite,' but to expel him, lest he prove a snare. And to say truth, it were too rigid and reasonless to proclaim such an enmity between man and man, were it not the type of a greater enmity between law and sin. I speak even now, as if sin were condemned in a perpetual Villenage never to be free by law, never to be manumitted: but sure sin can have no tenure by law at all, but is rather an eternal outlaw, and in hostility with law past all atonement: both diagonal contraries, as much allowing one another, as day and night together in one hemisphere. Or if it be possible, that sin with his darkness may come to composition, it cannot be without a foul eclipse and twilight to the law, whose brightness ought to surpass the noon. Thus we see how this unclean permissance defeats the sacred and glorious end both of the moral and judicial law.

As little good can the law-giver propose to equity by such a lavish remissness as this: if to remedy hardness of heart, Paræus and other divines confess, it more increases by this liberty, than is lessened: and how is it probable that their hearts were more hard in this, that it should be yielded to, than in any other crime? Their hearts were set upon usury, and are to this day, no nation more; yet that which was the endamaging only of their estates was narrowly forbid; this which is thought the extreme injury and dishonour of their wives and daughters, with the defilement also of themselves, is bounteously allowed. Their hearts were as hard under their best kings to offer in high places, though to the true God; yet that but a small thing, is strictly forewarned; this accounted a high offence against one of the greatest moral duties, is calmly permitted and established. How can it be evaded but that the heavy censure of Christ should fall worse upon this law-giver of theirs, than upon all the Scribes and Pharisees? For they did but omit judgment and mercy to trifle in mint and cummin, yet all according to law; but this their law-giver, altogether as punctual in such niceties, goes marching on to adulteries, through the violence of divorce by law against law. If it were such a cursed act of Pilate a subordinate judge to Cæsar, over-swayed by those hard hearts with much ado to suffer one transgression of law but once, what is it then with less ado to publish a law of transgression for many ages? Did God for this come down and cover the mount of Sinai with his glory, uttering in thunder those his sacred ordinances out of the bottomless treasures of his wisdom and infinite pureness, to patch up an ulcerous and rotten commonwealth with strict and stern injunctions, to wash the skin and garments for every unclean touch; and such easy permission given to pollute the soul with adulteries by public authority, without disgrace or question? No, it had been better that man had never known law or matrimony, than that such foul iniquity should be fastened upon

the Holy-one of Israel, the judge of all the earth; and such a piece of folly as Belzebub would not commit, to divide against himself, and prevent his own ends: or if he to compass more certain mischief, might yield perhaps to feign some good deed, yet that God should enact a licence of certain evil for uncertain good against his own glory and pureness, is abominable to conceive. And as it is destructive to the end of law, and blasphemous to the honour of the law-giver licensing, so is it as pernicious to the person licenced. If a private friend admonish not, the scripture saith, 'he hates his brother, and lets him perish;' but if he sooth him and allow him in his faults, the Proverbs teach us 'he spreads a net for his neighbour's feet, and worketh ruin.' If the magistrate or prince forget to administer due justice, and restrain not sin; Eli himself could say, 'it made the Lord's people to transgress.' But if he countenance them against law by his own example, what havoc it makes both in religion and virtue among the people, may be guessed by the anger it brought upon Hophni and Phineas, not to be appeased 'with sacrifice nor offering for ever.' If the law be silent to declare sin, the people must needs generally go astray, for the apostle himself saith, 'he had not known lust but by the law:' and surely such a nation seems not to be under the illuminating guidance of God's law, but under the horrible doom rather of such as despise the gospel; 'he that is filthy, let him be filthy still.' But where the law itself gives a warrant for sin, I know not what condition of misery to imagine miserable enough for such a people, unless that portion of the wicked, or rather of the damned, on whom God threatens in Psal xi. "to rain snares:" but that questionless cannot be by any law, which the apostle saith is 'a ministry ordained of God for our good,' and not so many ways and in so high a degree to our destruction, as we have now been graduating. And this is all the good can come to the person licensed in his hardness of heart.

I am next to mention that, which because it is a ground in divinity, Rom. iii. will save the labour of demonstrating, unless her given axioms be more doubted than in other arts (although it be no less firm in the precepts of philosophy) that a thing unlawful can for no good whatsoever be done, much less allowed by a positive law. And this is the matter why interpreters upon that passage in Hosea will not consent it to be a true story, that the prophet took a harlot to wife; because God being a pure spirit, could not command a thing repugnant to his own nature, no not for so good an end as to exhibit more to the life a wholesome and perhaps a converting parable to many an Israelite. Yet that he commanded the allowance of adulterous and injurious divorces for hardness of heart, a reason obscure and in a wrong sense, they can very favourably persuade themselves; so tenacious is the leaven of an old conceit. But they shift it; he permitted only. Yet silence in the law is consent, and consent is accessory: why then is not the law being silent, or not active against a crime, accessory to its own conviction, itself judging? For though we should grant, that it approves not, yet it wills; and the lawyers maxim is, that 'the will compelled is yet the will.' And though Aristotle in his ethics calls this a 'mixt Action,' yet he concludes it to be voluntary and inexcusable, if it be evil. How justly then might human law and philosophy rise up against the righteousness of Moses, if this be true which our vulgar divinity fathers upon him, yea upon God himself, not silently and only negatively to permit, but in his law to divulge a written and general privilege to commit and persist in unlawful divorces with a high hand, with security and no ill fame? for this is more than permitting and contriving, this is maintaining: this is warranting, this is protecting, yea this is doing evil, and such an evil as that reprobate law-giver did, whose lasting infamy is engraven upon him like a surname, 'he who made Israel to sin.' This is the lowest pitch contrary to God that publick fraud and injustice can descend.

If it be affirmed, that God, as being Lord, may do what he will; yet we must know that God hath not two wills, but one will, much less two contrary. If he once willed adultery should be sinful, and to be punished with death, all his omnipotence will not allow

allow him to will the allowance that his holiest people might as it were by his own Antinomie, or counter-statute, live unreprieved in the same fact as he himself esteemed it, according to our common explainers. The hidden ways of his providence we adore and search not, but the law is his revealed will, his compleat, his evident and certain will: herein he appears to us as it were in human shape, enters into covenant with us, swears to keep it, binds himself like a just law-giver to his own prescriptions, gives himself to be understood by men, judges and is judged, measures and is commensurate to right reason; cannot require less of us in one cantle of his law than in another, his legal justice cannot be so fickle and so variable, sometimes like a devouring fire, and by and by connivent in the embers, or, if I may so say, oscitant and supine. The vigour of his law could no more remit, than the hallowed fire upon his altar could be let go out. The lamps that burnt before him might need snuffing, but the light of his law never. Of this also more beneath, in discussing a solution of Rivetus.

The jesuits, and that sect among us which is named of Arminius, are wont to charge us of making God the author of sin, in two degrees especially, not to speak of his permission: 1. Because we hold that he hath decreed some to damnation, and consequently to sin, say they; next, because those means which are of saving knowledge to others, he makes to them an occasion of greater sin. Yet considering the perfection wherein man was created, and might have stood, no decree necessitating his free-will, but subsequent, though not in time, yet in order to causes, which were in his own power; they might methinks be persuaded to absolve both God and us. Whenas the doctrine of Plato and Chrysippus, with their followers, the Academics and the Stoics, who knew not what a consummate and most adorned Pandora was bestowed upon Adam to be the nurse and guide of his arbitrary happiness and perseverance, I mean his native innocence and perfection, which might have kept him from being our true Epimetheus; and though they taught of virtue and vice to be both the gift of divine Destiny, they could yet give reasons not invalid, to justify the councils of God and fate from the insultery of mortal tongues: that man's own free-will self-corrupted, is the adequate and sufficient cause of his disobedience besides Fate; as Homer also wanted not to express, both in his Iliad and Odyssey. And Manilius the poet, although in his fourth book he tells of some "created both to sin and punishment;" yet without murmuring, and with an industrious cheerfulness he acquits the Deity. They were not ignorant in their heathen lore, that it is most God-like to punish those who of his creatures became his enemies with the greatest punishment; and they could attain also to think that the greatest, when God himself throws a man farthest from him; which then they held he did, when he blinded, hardened, and stirred up his offenders, to finish and pile up their desperate work since they had undertaken it. To banish for ever into a local Hell, whether in the air or in the center, or in that uttermost and bottomless gulph of Chaos, deeper from holy bliss than the world's diameter multiplied; they thought not a punishing so proper and proportionate for God to inflict, as to punish sin with sin. Thus were the common sort of Gentiles wont to think, without any wry thoughts cast upon divine governance. And therefore Cicero, not in his Tusculan or Campanian retirements among the learned wits of that age, but even in the Senate to a mixt auditory, (though he were sparing otherwise to broach his philosophy among statists and lawyers) yet as to this point both in his oration against Piso, and in that which is about the answers of the sooth-sayers against Clodius, he declares it publickly as no paradox to common ears, that God cannot punish man more, nor make him more miserable, than still by making him more sinful. Thus we see how in this controversy the justice of God stood upright even among heathen disputers. But if any one be truly, and not pretendedly zealous for God's honour, here I call him forth before men and angels, to use his best and most advised skill, lest God more unavoidably than ever yet, and in the guiltiest manner, be made the author of sin: if he shall not only deliver over and incite his enemies by rebuke to sin as a punishment,

but shall by patent under his own broad-seal allow his friends whom he would sanctify and save, whom he would unite to himself, and not disjoin, whom he would correct by wholesome chastening, and not punish as he doth the damned by lewd sinning; if he shall allow these in his law, the perfect rule of his own purest will, and our most edified conscience, the perpetrating of an odious and manifold sin without the least contesting. 'Tis wondered how there can be in God a secret and revealed will; and yet what wonder, if there be in man two answerable causes. But here there must be two revealed wills grappling in a fraternal war with one another without any reasonable cause apprehended. This cannot be less than to ingraft sin into the substance of the law, which law is to provoke sin by crossing and forbidding, not by complying with it. Nay this is, which I tremble in uttering, to incarnate sin into the unpunishing and well-pleased will of God. To avoid these dreadful consequences that tread upon the heels of those allowances to sin, will be a task of far more difficulty than to appease those minds, which perhaps out of a vigilant and wary conscience except against predestination. Thus finally we may conclude, that a law wholly giving licence, cannot upon any good consideration be given to a holy people, for hardness of heart in the vulgar sense.

C H A P. IV.

That if divorce be no command, no more is marriage. That divorce could be no dispensation if it were sinful. The solution of Rivetus, That God dispensed by some unknown way, ought not to satisfy a christian mind.

OTHERS think to evade the matter by not granting any law of divorce, but only a dispensation, which is contrary to the words of Christ, who himself calls it a 'Law,' Mark x. 5. or if we speak of a command in the strictest definition, then marriage itself is no more a command than divorce, but only a free permission to him who cannot contain. But as to dispensation I affirm, the same as before of the law, that it can never be given to the allowance of sin: God cannot give it neither in respect of himself, nor in respect of man; not in respect of himself, being a most pure essence, the just avenger of sin; neither can he make that cease to be a sin, which is in itself unjust and impure, as all divorces they say were, which were not for adultery. Not in respect of man, for then it must be either to his good or to his evil. Not to his good; for how can that be imagined any good to a sinner, whom nothing but rebuke and due correction can save, to hear the determinate oracle of divine law louder than any reproof dispensing and providing for the impunity, and convenience of sin; to make that doubtful, or rather lawful, which the end of the law was to make most evidently hateful? Nor to the evil of man can a dispense be given; for if 'the law were ordained unto life,' Rom. vii. 10. how can the same God publish dispensations against that law, which must needs be unto death? Absurd and monstrous would that dispense be, if any judge or law should give it a man to cut his own throat, or to damn himself. Dispense therefore presupposes full pardon, or else it is not a dispense, but a most baneful and bloody snare. And why should God enter covenant with a people to be holy, as 'the command is holy and just, and good,' Rom. vii. 12. and yet suffer an impure and treacherous dispense to mislead and betray them under the vizard of law to a legitimate practice of uncleanness? God is no covenant-breaker; he cannot do this.

Rivetus, a diligent and learned writer, having well weighed what hath been written by those founders of dispense, and finding the small agreement among them, would fain work himself aloof these rocks and quick-sands, and thinks it best to conclude that God certainly did dispense, but by some way to us unknown, and so to leave it. But to this

I oppose, that a christian by no means ought to rest himself in such an ignorance; whereby so many absurdities will strait reflect both against the purity, justice, and wisdom of God, the end also both of law and gospel, and the comparison of them both together. God indeed in some ways of his providence is high and secret, past finding out: but in the delivery and execution of his law, especially in the managing of a duty so daily and so familiar as this is whereof we reason, hath plain enough revealed himself, and requires the observance thereof not otherwise, than to the law of nature and equity imprinted in us seems correspondent. And he hath taught us to love and to extol his laws, not only as they are his, but as they are just and good to every wise and sober understanding. Therefore Abraham, even to the face of God himself, seemed to doubt of divine justice, if it should swerve from the irradiation wherewith it had enlightened the mind of man, and bound itself to observe its own rule; 'wilt thou destroy the righteous with the wicked? that be far from thee; shall not the judge of the earth do right?' Thereby declaring, that God hath created a righteousness in right itself, against which he cannot do. So David, Psalm cxix. 'The testimonies which thou hast commanded are righteous and very faithful; thy word is very pure, therefore thy servant loveth it.' Not only then for the author's sake, but for its own purity. 'He is faithful,' saith St. Paul, 'he cannot deny himself;' that is, cannot deny his own promises, cannot but be true to his own rules. He often pleads with men the uprightness of his ways by their own principles. How should we imitate him else, to 'be perfect as he is perfect?' If at pleasure he can dispense with golden poetic ages of such pleasing licence, as in the fabled reign of old Saturn, and this perhaps before the law might have some covert, but under such an undispensing covenant as Moses made with them, and not to tell us why and wherefore, indulgence cannot give quiet to the breast of an intelligent man? We must be resolved how the law can be pure and perspicuous, and yet throw a polluted skirt over these Eleusinian mysteries, that no man can utter what they mean: worse in this than the worst obscenities of heathen superstition; for their filthiness was hid, but the mystic reason thereof, known to their sages. But this Jewish imputed filthiness was daily and open, but the reason of it is not known to our divines. We know of no design the gospel can have to impose new righteousness upon works, but to remit the old by faith without works, if we mean justifying works: we know no mystery our Saviour could have to lay new bonds upon marriage in the covenant of grace which himself had loosened to the severity of law. So that Rivetus may pardon us, if we cannot be contented with his non-solution, to remain in such a peck of uncertainties and doubts, so dangerous and ghastly to the fundamentals of our faith.

C H A P. V.

What a Dispensation is.

Therefore to get some better satisfaction, we must proceed to inquire as diligently as we can what a dispensation is, which I find to be either properly so called, or improperly. Improperly so called, is rather a particular and exceptive law, absolving and disobliging from a more general command for some just and reasonable cause. As Numb. ix. they who were unclean, or in a journey, had leave to keep the passover in the second month, but otherwise ever in the first. As for that in Leviticus of marrying the brother's wife, it was a penal statute rather than a dispense; and commands nothing injurious or in itself unclean, only prefers a special reason of charity before an institutive decency, and perhaps is meant for life-time only, as is exprest beneath in the prohibition of taking two sisters. What other edict of Moses, carrying but the semblance of a law in any other kind, may bear the name of a dispense, I have not readily to instance.

But

But a dispensation most properly is some particular accident rarely happening, and therefore not specified in the law, but left to the decision of charity, even under the bondage of Jewish rites, much more under the liberty of the Gospel. Thus did 'David enter into the house of God, and did eat the shewbread, he and his followers, which was' ceremonially 'unlawful.' Of such dispensations as these it was that Verdune the French divine so gravely disputed in the council of Trent against friar Adrian, who held that the pope might dispense with any thing. 'It is a fond persuasion,' saith Verdune, 'that dispensing is a favour; nay, it is as good distributive justice as what is most, and the priest sins if he gives it not, for it is nothing else but a right interpretation of law.' Thus far that I can learn touching this matter wholesomely decreed. But that God, who is the giver of every good and perfect gift, Jam. i. should give out a rule and directory to sin by, should enact a dispensation as long-lived as a law, whereby to live in privileged adultery for hardness of heart; (and this obdurate disease cannot be conceived how it was the more amended by this unclean remedy,) is the most deadly and scorpion-like gift that the enemy of mankind could have given to any miserable sinner, and is rather such a dispensation as that was which the serpent gave to our first parents. God gave quails in his wrath, and kings in his wrath, yet neither of these things evil in themselves: but that he whose eyes cannot behold impurity, should in the book of his holy covenant, his most unpassionate law, give licence and statute for uncontrolled adultery, although it go for the received opinion, I shall ever dissuade my soul from such a creed, such an indulgence as the shop of antichrist never forged a baser.

C H A P. VI.

That the Jew had no more right to this supposed dispensation than the Christian hath, and rather not so much.

BUT if we must needs dispense, let us for a while so far dispense with truth, as to grant that sin may be dispensed; yet there will be copious reason found to prove that the Jew had no more right to such a supposed indulgence than the christian; whether we look at the clear knowledge wherein he lived, or the strict performance of works whereto he was bound. Besides visions and prophecies, they had the law of God, which in the Psalms and Proverbs is chiefly praised for sureness and certainty, both easy and perfect to the enlightning of the simple. How could it be so obscure then, or they so sottishly blind in this plain, moral, and household duty? They had the same precepts about marriage; Christ added nothing to their clearness, for that had argued them imperfect; he opens not the law, but removes the Pharisaic mists raised between the law and the peoples eyes: the only sentence which he adds, 'What God hath joined let no man put asunder,' is as obscure as any clause fetched out of Genesis, and hath increased a yet undecided controversy of clandestine marriages. If we examine over all his sayings, we shall find him not so much interpreting the law with his words, as referring his own words to be interpreted by the law, and oftener obscures his mind in short, and vehement, and compact sentences, to blind and puzzle them the more who would not understand the law. The Jews therefore were as little to be dispensed with for lack of moral knowledge as we.

Next, none I think will deny, but that they were as much bound to perform the law as any christian. That severe and rigorous knife not sparing the tender foreskin of any male infant, to carve upon his flesh the mark of that strict and pure covenant whereinto he entered, might give us to understand enough against the fancy of dispensing. St. Paul testifies, that every 'circumcised man is a debtor to the whole law,' Gal. v. or else

'circumcision

'circumcision is in vain,' Rom. ii. 25. How vain then, and how preposterous must it needs be to exact a circumcision of the flesh from an infant unto an outward sign of purity, and to dispense an uncircumcision in the soul of a grown man to an inward and real impurity? How vain again was that law to impose tedious expiations for every slight sin of ignorance and error, and to privilege without penance or disturbance an odious crime whether of ignorance or obstinacy? How unjust also inflicting death and extirpation for the mark of circumstantial pureness omitted, and proclaiming all honest and liberal indemnity to the act of a substantial impureness committed, making void the covenant that was made against it? Thus if we consider the tenor of the law, to be circumcised and to perform all, not pardoning so much as the escapes of error and ignorance, and compare this with the condition of the gospel, 'Believe and be baptized,' I suppose it cannot be long ere we grant that the Jew was bound as strictly to the performance of every duty, as was possible; and therefore could not be dispensed with more than the christian, perhaps not so much.

C H A P. VII.

That the Gospel is apter to dispense than the Law. Paræus answered.

IF then the law will afford no reason why the Jew should be more gently dealt with than the christian, then surely the gospel can afford as little why the christian should be less gently dealt with than the Jew. The gospel indeed exhorts to highest perfection, but bears with weakest infirmity more than the law. Hence those indulgences, 'all cannot receive this saying, every man hath his proper gift,' with express charges not to 'lay on yokes which our fathers could not bear.' The nature of man still is as weak, and yet as hard; and that weakness and hardness as unfit and as unteachable to be harshly used as ever. Ay but, saith Paræus, there is a greater portion of spirit poured upon the gospel, which requires from us perfecter obedience. I answer, this does not prove that the law therefore might give allowance to sin more than the gospel; and if it were no sin, we know it the work of the spirit to 'mortify our corrupt desires and evil concupiscence;' but not to root up our natural affections and disaffections, moving to and fro even in wisest men upon just and necessary reasons, which were the true ground of that Mosaic dispense, and is the utmost extent of our pleading. What is more or less perfect we dispute not, but what is sin or no sin. And in that I still affirm the law required as perfect obedience as the gospel: besides that the prime end of the gospel is not so much to exact our obedience, as to reveal grace, and the satisfaction of our disobedience. What is now exacted from us, it is the accusing law that does it, even yet under the gospel; but cannot be more extreme to us now than to the Jews of old; for the law ever was of works, and the gospel ever was of grace.

Either then the law by harmless and needful dispensations, which the gospel is now made to deny, must have anticipated and exceeded the grace of the gospel, or else must be found to have given politic and superficial graces without real pardon, saying in general, 'Do this and live,' and yet deceiving and damning under-hand with unsound and hollow permissions; which is utterly abhorring from the end of all law, as hath been shewed. But if those indulgences were safe and sinless, out of tenderness and compassion, as indeed they were, and yet shall be abrogated by the gospel; then the law, whose end is by rigour to magnify grace, shall itself give grace, and pluck a fair plume from the gospel; instead of hastening us thither, alluring us from it. And whereas the terror of
the

the law was as a servant to amplify and illustrate the mildness of grace; now the mildness of evangelic grace shall turn servant, to declare the grace and mildness of the rigorous law. The law was harsh to extol the grace of the gospel, and now the gospel by a new affected strictness of her own shall extenuate the grace which herself offers. For by exacting a duty which the law dispensed, if we perform it, then is grace diminished, by how much performance advances, unless the apostle argue wrong: if we perform it not, and perish for not performing, then are the conditions of grace harder than those of rigour. If through faith and repentance we perish not, yet grace still remains the less, by requiring that which rigour did not require, or at least not so strictly. Thus much therefore to Paræus; that if the gospel require perfecter obedience than the law as a duty, it exalts the law, and debases itself, which is dishonourable to the work of our redemption. Seeing therefore that all the causes of any allowance that the Jews might have, remain as well to the Christians; this is a certain rule, that so long as the causes remain, the allowance ought. And having thus at length inquired the truth concerning law and dispense, their ends, their uses, their limits, and in what manner both Jew and Christian stand liable to the one or capable of the other; we may safely conclude, that to affirm the giving of any law or lawlike dispense to sin for hardness of heart, is a doctrine of that extravagance from the sage principles of piety, that whoso considers thoroughly, cannot but admire how this hath been digested all this while.

C H A P VIII.

The true sense how Moses suffered divorce for hardness of heart.

WHAT may we do then to save this seeming inconsistency? I must not dissemble that I am confident it can be done no other way than this:

Moses, Deut. xxiv. 1. established a grave and prudent law, full of moral equity, full of due consideration towards nature, that cannot be resisted, a law consenting with the laws of wisest men and civilest nations; that when a man hath married a wife, if it come to pass that he cannot love her by reason of some displeasing natural quality or unfitness in her, let him write her a bill of divorce. The intent of which law undoubtedly was this, that if any good and peaceable man should discover some helpless disagreement or dislike either of mind or body, whereby he could not chearfully perform the duty of a husband without the perpetual dissembling of offence and disturbance to his spirit; rather than to live uncomfortably and unhappily both to himself and to his wife; rather than to continue undertaking a duty which he could not possibly discharge, he might dismiss her whom he could not tolerably and so not conscionably retain. And this law the spirit of God by the mouth of Solomon, Prov. xxx. 21, 23. testifies to be a good and a necessary law, by granting it that 'a hated woman' (for so the Hebrew word signifies, rather than 'odious', though it come all to one) that 'a hated woman, when she is married, is a thing that the earth cannot bear.' What follows then but that the charitable law must remedy what nature cannot undergo? Now that many licentious and hard-hearted men took hold of this law to cloke their bad purposes, is nothing strange to believe. And these were they, not for whom Moses made the law, (God forbid!) but whose hardness of heart taking ill-advantage by this law, he held it better to suffer as by accident, where it could not be detected, rather than good men should lose their just and lawful privilege of remedy: Christ therefore having to answer these tempting pharisees, according as his custom was, not meaning to inform their proud ignorance what Moses did in the true intent of the law, which they had ill cited, suppressing the true cause for which Moses gave it, and extending it to every slight matter, tells them
their

their own, what Moses was forced to suffer by their abuse of his law. Which is yet more plain if we mark that our Saviour in Mat. v. cites not the law of Moses, but the pharisaical tradition falsely grounded upon that law. And in those other places, chap. xix. and Mark x. the Pharisees cite the law, but conceal the wise and human reason there expressed; which our Saviour corrects not in them, whose pride deserved not his instruction, only returns them what is proper to them; 'Moses for the hardness of your heart suffered you,' that is such as you, 'to put away your wives; and to you he wrote this precept for that cause,' which '(to you)' must be read with an impression, and understood limitedly of such as covered ill purposes under that law: for it was seasonable that they should hear their own unbounded licence rebuked, but not seasonable for them to hear a good man's requisite liberty explained. But us he hath taught better, if we have ears to hear. He himself acknowledged it to be a law, Mark x. and being a law of God, it must have an undoubted "end of charity, which may be used with a pure heart, a good conscience, and faith unfeigned," as was heard: it cannot allow sin, but is purposely to resist sin, as by the same chapter to Timothy appears. There we learn also, "that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully." Out of doubt then there must be a certain good in this law, which Moses willingly allowed, and there might be an unlawful use made thereof by hypocrites; and that was it which was unwillingly suffered, foreseeing it in general, but not able to discern it in particulars. Christ therefore mentions not here what Moses and the law intended; for good men might know that by many other rules: and the scornful Pharisees were not fit to be told, until they could employ that knowledge they had less abusively. Only he acquaints them with what Moses by them was put to suffer.

C H A P. IX.

The words of the institution how to be understood; and of our Saviour's Answer to his Disciples.

AND to entertain a little their overweening arrogance as best befitted, and to amaze them yet further, because they thought it no hard matter to fulfil the law, he draws them up to that inseparable institution which God ordained in the beginning before the fall, when man and woman were both perfect, and could have no cause to separate: just as in the same chapter he stands not to contend with the arrogant young man, who boasted his observance of the whole law, whether he had indeed kept it or not, but skrews him up higher to a task of that perfection, which no man is bound to imitate. And in like manner, that pattern of the first institution he set before the opinionative Pharisees, to dazzle them, and not to bind us. For this is a solid rule, that every command given with a reason, binds our obedience no otherwise than that reason holds. Of this sort was that command in Eden; "Therefore shall a man cleave to his wife, and they shall be one flesh;" which we see is no absolute command, but with an inference, 'Therefore:' the reason then must be first considered, that our obedience be not disobedience. The first is, for it is not single, because the wife is to the husband 'flesh of his flesh,' as in the verse going before. But this reason cannot be sufficient of itself: for why then should he for his wife leave his father and mother, with whom he is far more 'flesh of flesh, and bone of bone,' as being made of their substance? And besides, it can be but a sorry, and ignoble society of life, whose inseparable injunction depends merely upon flesh and bones. Therefore we must look higher, since Christ himself recalls us to the beginning, and we shall find that the primitive reason of never divorcing, was that sacred and not vain promise of God to remedy man's loneliness by 'making him a meet help for him,' tho' not now in perfection;

as at first; yet still in proportion as things now are. And this is repeated verse 20. when all other creatures were fitly associated and brought to Adam, as if the divine power had been in some care and deep thought, because 'there was not yet found an help-meet for Man.' And can we so slightly depress the all-wise purpose of a deliberating God, as if his consultation had produced no other good for man but to join him with an accidental companion of propagation, which his sudden word had already made for every beast? nay a far less good to man it will be found, if she must at all adventures be fastned upon him individually. And therefore even plain sense and equity, and, which is above them both, the all-interpreting voice of charity herself cries loud that this primitive reason, this consulted promise of God 'to make a meet help,' is the only cause that gives authority to this command of not divorcing, to be a command. And it might be further added, that if the true definition of a wife were asked in good earnest, this clause of being 'a meet help' would shew itself so necessary and so essential, in that demonstrative argument, that it might be logically concluded: therefore she who naturally and perpetually is no 'meet help,' can be no wife; which clearly takes away the difficulty of dismissing such a one. If this be not thought enough, I answer yet further, that marriage, unless it mean a fit and tolerable marriage, is not inseparable neither by nature nor institution. Not by nature, for then those Mosaic divorces had been against nature, if separable and inseparable be contraries, as who doubts they be? and what is against nature is against law, if soundest philosophy abuse us not: by this reckoning Moses should be most unmosaic, that is most illegal, not to say most unnatural. Nor is it inseparable by the first institution: for then no second institution of the same law for so many causes could dissolve it; it being most unworthy a human, (as Plato's judgment is in the fourth book of his laws) much more a divine lawgiver, to write two several decrees upon the same thing. But what would Plato have deemed if one of these were good, and the other evil to be done? Lastly, suppose it be inseparable by institution, yet in competition with higher things, as religion and charity in mainest matters, and when the chief end is frustrate for which it was ordained, as hath been shewn; if still it must remain inseparable, it holds a strange and lawless propriety from all other works of God under heaven. From these many considerations, we may safely gather, that so much of the first institution as our Saviour mentions, for he mentions not all, was but to quell and put to nonplus the tempting Pharisees, and to lay open their ignorance and shallow understanding of the Scriptures. For, saith he, "Have ye not read that he which made them at the beginning, made them male and female, and said, for this cause shall a man cleave to his wife?" which these blind usurpers of Moses's chair could not gainsay: as if this single respect of male and female were sufficient against a thousand inconveniences and mischiefs, to clog a rational creature to his endless sorrow unrelinquishably, under the guileful superscription of his intended solace and comfort. What if they had thus answered? Master, if thou mean to make wedlock, as inseparable as it was from the beginning, let it be made also a fit society, as God meant it, which we shall soon understand it ought to be, if thou recite the whole reason of the law. Doubtless our Saviour had applauded their just answer. For then they had expounded his command of paradise, even as Moses himself expounds it by his laws of divorce, that is, with due and wise regard to the premises and reasons of the first command; according to which, without unclean and temporizing permissions, he instructs us in this imperfect state what we may lawfully do about divorce.

But if it be thought that the disciples, offended at the rigour of Christ's answer, could yet obtain no mitigation of the former sentence pronounced to the Pharisees, it may be fully answered, that our Saviour continues the same reply to his disciples, as men leavened with the same customary licence which the Pharisees maintained, and displeased at the removing of a traditional abuse, whereto they had so long not unwillingly been used: it was no time then to contend with their slow and prejudicial belief, in a thing wherein an ordinary measure of light in Scripture, with some attention, might afterwards inform them well

well enough. And yet ere Christ had finished this argument, they might have picked out of his own concluding words an answer more to their minds, and in effect the same with that which hath been all this while intreating audience: "All men," saith he "cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given; he that is able to receive it, let him receive it." What saying is this which is left to a man's choice to receive, or not receive? What but the married life? Was our Saviour so mild and so favourable to the weakness of a single man, and is he turned on the sudden so rigorous and inexorable, to the distresses and extremities of an ill-wedded man? Did he so graciously give leave to change the better single life for the worse married life? Did he open so to us this hazardous and accidental door of marriage, to shut upon us like the gate of death, without retracting or returning, without permitting to change the worst, most insupportable, most unchristian mischance of marriage, for all the mischiefs and sorrows that can ensue, being an ordinance which was especially given as a cordial and exhilarating cup of solace, the better to bear our other crosses and afflictions? Questionless this was a hard-heartedness of divorcing, worse than that in the Jews, which they say extorted the allowance from Moses, and is utterly dissonant from all the doctrine of our Saviour. After these considerations therefore, to take a law out of paradise given in time of original perfection, and to take it barely without those just and equal inferences and reasons which mainly establish it, nor so much as admitting those needful and safe allowances wherewith Moses himself interprets it to the fallen condition of man; argues nothing in us but rashness and contempt of those means that God left us in his pure and chaste law, without which it will not be possible for us to perform the strict imposition of this command: or if we strive beyond our strength, we shall strive to obey it otherwise than God commands it. And lamented experience daily teaches the bitter and vain fruits of this our presumption, forcing men in a thing wherein we are not able to judge either of their strength or of their sufferance. Whom neither one vice nor other by natural addiction, but only marriage ruins, which doubtless is not the fault of that ordinance, for God gave it as a blessing, nor always of man's mischusing, it being an error above wisdom to prevent, as examples of wisest men so mistaken manifest: It is the fault therefore of a perverse opinion that will have it continued in despite of nature and reason, when indeed it was never so truly joined. All those expositors upon the fifth of Matthew confess the law of Moses to be the law of the Lord, wherein no addition or diminution hath place; yet coming to the point of divorce, as if they feared not to be called least in the kingdom of heaven, any slight evasion will content them, to reconcile those contradictions which they make between Christ and Moses, between Christ and Christ.

C H A P. X.

The vain shift of those who make the law of divorce to be only the premises of a succeeding law.

SOME will have it no law, but the granted premises of another law following, contrary to the words of Christ, Mark x. 5. and all other translations of gravest authority, who render it in form of a law, agreeable to Mal. ii. 16. as it is most anciently and modernly expounded. Besides, the bill of divorce, and the particular occasion therein mentioned, declares it to be orderly and legal. And what avails this to make the matter more righteous, if such an adulterous condition shall be mentioned to build a law upon without either punishment or so much as forbidding? They pretend it is implicitly reprov'd in these words, Deut. xxiv. 4. "after she is defiled;" but who sees not that this defilement is only in respect of returning to her former husband after an intermixt marriage? else why was not the defiling condition first forbidden, which would have saved the labour of this after-

law? Nor is it seemly or piously attributed to the justice of God and his known hatred of sin, that such a heinous fault as this through all the law should be only wiped with an implicit and oblique touch, (which yet is falsely supposed) and that his peculiar people should be let wallow in adulterous marriages almost two thousand years, for want of a direct law to prohibit them: it is rather to be confidently assumed that this was granted to apparent necessities, as being of unquestionable right and reason in the law of nature, in that it still passes without inhibition, even when greatest cause is given to us to expect it should be directly forbidden.

C H A P. XI.

The other shift of saying divorce was permitted by law, but not approved. More of the institution.

BUT it was not approved. So much the worse that it was allowed; as if sin had overmastered the word of God, to conform her stiddy and strait rule to sin's crookedness, which is impossible. Besides, what needed a positive grant of that which was not approved? It restrained no liberty to him that could but use a little fraud; it had been better silenced unless it were approved in some case or other. But still it was not approved. Miserable excusers! he who doth evil that good may come thereby, approves not what he doth; and yet the grand rule forbids him, and counts his damnation just if he do it. The sorceress Medea did not approve her own evil doings, yet looked not to be excused for that: and it is the constant opinion of Plato in Protagoras, and other of his dialogues, agreeing with that proverbial sentence among the Greeks, that "No man is wicked willingly." Which also the Peripatetics do rather distinguish than deny. What great thank then if any man, reputed wise and constant, will neither do, nor permit others under his charge to do that which he approves not, especially in matter of sin? But for a judge, but for a magistrate, the shepherd of his people, to surrender up his approbation against law and his own judgment, to the obstinacy of his herd; what more unjudge like, more un-magistrate-like, and in war more un-commander-like? Twice in a short time it was the undoing of the Roman state, first when Pompey, next when Marcus Brutus, had not magnanimity enough but to make so poor a resignation of what they approved, to what the boisterous tribunes and soldiers bawled for. Twice it was the saving of two the greatest commonwealths in the world, of Athens by Themistocles at the sea fight of Salamis; of Rome by Fabius Maximus in the Punic war, for that these two matchless generals had the fortitude at home against the rashness and the clamours of their own captains and confederates, to withstand the doing or permitting of what they could not approve in their duty of their great command. Thus far of civil prudence. But when we speak of sin, let us look again upon the old reverend Eli; who in his heavy punishment found no difference between the doing and permitting of what he did not approve. If hardness of heart in the people may be an excuse, why then is Pilate branded through all memory? He approved not what he did, he openly protested, he washed his hands, and laboured not a little ere he would yield to the hard hearts of a whole people, both princes and plebeans, importuning and tumulting even to the fear of a revolt. Yet is there any will undertake his cause? If therefore Pilate for suffering but one act of cruelty against law, though with much unwillingness testified, at the violent demand of a whole nation, shall stand so black upon record to all posterity; alas for Moses! what shall we say for him, while we are taught to believe he suffered not one act only both of cruelty and uncleanness in one divorce, but made it a plain and lasting law against law, whereby ten thousand acts accounted both cruel and unclean, might be daily committed, and this without the least suit or petition of the people that we can read of?

And

And can we conceive without vile thoughts, that the majesty and holiness of God, could endure so many ages to gratify a stubborn people in the practice of a foul polluting sin? and could he expect they should abstain, he not signifying his mind in a plain command, at such time especially when he was framing their laws and them to all possible perfection? But they were to look back to the first institution; nay rather why was not that individual institution brought out of paradise, as was that of the sabbath, and repeated in the body of the law, that men might have understood it to be a command? for that any sentence that bears the resemblance of a precept, set there so out of place in another world, at such a distance from the whole law, and not once mentioned there, should be an obliging command to us, is very disputable; and perhaps it might be denied to be a command without further dispute: however, it commands not absolutely, as hath been cleared, but only with reference to that precedent promise of God, which is the very ground of his institution: if that appear not in some tolerable sort, how can we affirm such a matrimony to be the same which God instituted? In such an accident it will best behove our soberness to follow rather what moral Sinai prescribes equal to our strength, than fondly to think within our strength all that lost paradise relates.

C H A P. XII.

The third shift of them who esteem it a mere judicial law.
Proved again to be a law of moral equity.

ANother while it shall suffice them, that it was not a moral but a judicial law, and so was abrogated: nay rather not abrogated because judicial; which law the ministry of Christ came not to deal with. And who put it in man's power to exempt, where Christ speaks in general of not abrogating "the least jot or tittle," and in special not that of divorce, because it follows among those laws which he promised expressly not to abrogate, but to vindicate from abusive traditions? which is most evidently to be seen in the xvi. of Luke, where this caution of not abrogating is inserted immediately, and not otherwise than purposely, when no other point of the law is touched but that of divorce. And if we mark the 31st verse of Mat. v. he there cites not the law of Moses, but the licentious gloss which traduced the law; that therefore which he cited, that he abrogated, and not only abrogated, but disallowed and flatly condemned; which could not be the law of Moses, for that had been foully to the rebuke of his great servant. To abrogate a law made with God's allowance, had been to tell us only that such a law was now to cease: but to refute it with an ignominious note of civilizing adultery, casts the reproof which was meant only to the Pharisees, even upon him that made the law. But yet if that be judicial which belongs to a civil court, this law is less judicial than nine of the ten commandments: for antiquaries affirm, that divorces proceeded among the Jews without knowledge of the magistrate, only with hands and seals under the testimony of some Rabbi's to be then present. Perkins, in "a Treatise of Conscience," grants, that what in the judicial law is of common equity, binds also the Christian: and how to judge of this, prescribes two ways: if wise nations have enacted the like decree: or if it maintain the good of family, church, or commonwealth. This therefore is a pure moral œconomical law, too hastily imputed of tolerating sin; being rather so clear in nature and reason, that it was left to a man's own arbitrement to be determined between God and his own conscience; not only among the Jews, but in every wise nation: the restraint whereof, who is not too thick-sighted, may see how hurtful and distractive it is to the house, the church, and commonwealth. And that power which Christ never took from the master of a family, but rectified only to a right and wary use at home; that power the undiscerning canonist hath improperly usurpt in his court-leet, and bescribbled with

with a thousand trifling impertinencies, which yet have filled the life of man with serious trouble and calamity. Yet grant it were of old a judicial law, it need not be the less moral for that, being conversant as it is about virtue or vice. And our Saviour disputes not here the judicature, for that was not his office, but the morality of divorce, whether it be adultery or no; if therefore he touch the law of Moses at all, he touches the moral part thereof, which is absurd to imagine, that the covenant of grace should reform the exact and perfect law of works, eternal and immutable; or if he touch not the law at all, then is not the allowance thereof disallowed to us.

C H A P. XIII.

The ridiculous opinion that divorce was permitted from the custom in Ægypt. That Moses gave not this law unwillingly. Perkins confesses this law was not abrogated.

Others are so ridiculous as to alledge that this licence of divorcing was given them because they were so accustomed in Ægypt. As if an ill custom were to be kept to all posterity; for the dispensation is both universal and of time unlimited, and so indeed no dispensation at all: for the over-dated dispensation of a thing unlawful, serves for nothing but to increase hardness of heart, and makes men but wax more incorrigible; which were a great reproach to be said of any law or allowance that God should give us. In these opinions it would be more religion to advise well, lest we make ourselves juster than God, by censuring rashly that for sin which his unspotted law without rebuke allows, and his people without being conscious of displeasing him have used: and if we can think so of Moses, as that the Jewish obstinacy could compel him to write such impure permissions against the word of God and his own judgment; doubtless it was his part to have protested publickly what straits he was driven to, and to have declared his conscience, when he gave any law against his mind: for the law is the touch-stone of sin and of conscience, and must not be intermixed with corrupt indulgencies; for then it loses the greatest praise it has of being certain, and infallible, not leading into error as the Jews were led by this connivance of Moses, if it were a connivance. But still they fly back to the primitive institution, and would have us re-enter paradise against the sword that guards it. Whom I again thus reply to, that the place in Genesis contains the description of a fit and perfect marriage, with an interdict of ever divorcing such a union: but where nature is discovered to have never joined indeed, but vehemently seeks to part, it cannot be there conceived that God forbids it; nay, he commands it both in the law and in the prophet Malachy, which is to be our rule. And Perkins upon this chapter of Matthew deals plainly, that our Saviour here confutes not Moses's law, but the false glosses that depraved the law; which being true, Perkins must needs grant, that something then is left to that law which Christ found no fault with; and what can that be but the conscionable use of such liberty, as the plain words import? So that by his own inference, Christ did not absolutely intend to restrain all divorces to the only cause of adultery. This therefore is the true scope of our Saviour's will, that he who looks upon the law concerning divorce, should also look back upon the institution, that he may endeavour what is perfectest: and he that looks upon the institution shall not refuse as sinful and unlawful those allowances which God affords him in his following law, lest he make himself purer than his maker, and presuming above strength, slip into temptations irrecoverably. For this is wonderful, that in all those decrees concerning marriage, God should never once mention the prime institution to dissuade them from divorcing, and that he should forbid smaller sins as opposite to the hardness of their hearts, and let this adulterous matter of divorce pass ever unreprieved.

This

This is also to be marvelled, that seeing Christ did not condemn whatever it was that Moses suffered, and that thereupon the Christian magistrate permits usury and open stews, and here with us adultery to be so slightly punished, which was punished by death to these hard-hearted Jews; why we should strain thus at the matter of divorce, which may stand so much with charity to permit, and make no scruple to allow usury esteemed to be so much against charity? But this it is to embroil ourselves against the righteous and all-wise judgments and statutes of God; which are not variable and contrarious, as we would make them, one while permitting, and another while forbidding, but are most constant and most harmonious each to other. For how can the uncorrupt and majestic law of God, bearing in her hand the wages of life and death, harbour such a repugnance within herself, as to require an unexempted and impartial obedience to all her decrees, either from us or from our mediator, and yet debase herself to faulter so many ages with circumcised adulteries by unclean and slubbering permissions?

C H A P. XIV.

That Beza's opinion of regulating sin by apostolic law cannot be found.

YET Beza's opinion is, that a politic law, (but what politic law, I know not, unless one of Machiavel's) may regulate sin; may bear indeed, I grant, with imperfection for a time, as those canons of the Apostles did in ceremonial things: but as for sin, the essence of it cannot consist with rule; and if the law fail to regulate sin, and not to take it utterly away, it necessarily confirms and establishes sin. To make a regularity of sin by law, either the law must streighten sin into no sin, or sin must crook the law into no law. The judicial law can serve to no other end than to be the protector and champion of religion and honest civility, as is set down plainly Rom. xiii. and is but the arm of moral law, which can no more be separate from justice, than justice from virtue. Their office also, in a different manner, steers the same course; the one teaches what is good by precept, the other unteaches what is bad by punishment. But if we give way to politic dispensations of lewd uncleanness, the first good consequence of such a relax will be the justifying of papal stews, joined with a toleration of epidemic whoredom. Justice must revolt from the end of her authority, and become the patron of that whereof she was created the punisher. The example of usury, which is commonly alledged, makes against the allegation which it brings, as I touched before. Besides that usury, so much as is permitted by the magistrate, and demanded with common equity, is neither against the word of God, nor the rule of charity; as hath been often discussed by men of eminent learning and judgment: There must be therefore some other example found out to shew us wherein civil policy may with warrant from God settle wickedness by law, and make that lawful which is lawless. Although I doubt not but upon deeper consideration, that which is true in physick will be found as true in policy, that as of bad pulses those that beat most in order, are much worse than those that keep the most inordinate circuit; so of popular vices those that may be committed legally, will be more pernicious than those that are left to their own course at peril, not under a stinted privilege to sin orderly and regularly, which is an implicate contradiction, but under due and fearless execution of punishment.

The political law, since it cannot regulate vice, is to restrain it by using all means to root it out. But if it suffer the weed to grow up to any pleasurable or contented height upon what pretext soever, it fastens the root, it prunes and dresses vice, as if it were a good plant. Let no man doubt therefore to affirm, that it is not so hurtful or dishonourable to a commonwealth, nor so much to the hardening of hearts, when those worse faults pre-
tended

tended to be feared are committed, by whoſo dares under ſtrict and executed penalty, as when thoſe leſs faults tolerated for fear of greater harden their faces, not their hearts only, under the protection of public authority. For what leſs indignity were this, than as if juſtice herſelf, the queen of virtues (deſcending from her ſceptered royalty) inſtead of conquering ſhould compound and treat with ſin, her eternal adverſary and rebel, upon ignoble terms? or as if the judicial law were like that untruſty ſteward in the goſpel, and inſtead of calling in the debts of his moral maſter, ſhould give out ſubtile and ſly acquittances to keep himſelf from begging? Or let us perſon him like ſome wretched itinerary judge, who to gratify his delinquents before him, would let them baſely break his head, leſt they ſhould pull him from the bench, and throw him over the bar. Unleſs we had rather think both moral and judicial, full of malice and deadly purpoſe, conſpired to let the debtor Iſraelite, the ſeed of Abraham, run on upon a bankrupt ſcore, flattered with inſufficient and enſnaring diſcharges, that ſo he might be haled to a more cruel forfeit for all the indulgent arrears which thoſe judicial acquittances had engaged him in. No, no, this cannot be, that the law, whoſe integrity and faithfulneſs is next to God, ſhould be either the ſhameleſs broker of our impunities, or the intended inſtrument of our deſtruction. The method of holy correction, ſuch as became the commonwealth of Iſrael, is not to bribe ſin with ſin, to capitulate and hire out one crime with another; but with more noble and graceful ſeverity than Popilius the Roman legate uſed with Antiochus, to limit and level out the direct way from vice to virtue, with ſtraighteſt and exacteſt lines on either ſide, not winding or indenting ſo much as to the right hand of fair pretences. Violence indeed and inſurrection may force the law to ſuffer what it cannot mend; but to write a decree in allowance of ſin, as ſoon can the hand of juſtice rot off. Let this be ever concluded as a truth that will outlive the faith of thoſe that ſeek to bear it down.

C H A P. XV.

That divorce was not given for wives only, as Beza, and Pareus write. More of the inſtitution.

LAſtly, if divorce were granted, as Beza and others ſay, not for men, but to releaſe afflicted wives; certainly, it is not only a diſpenſation, but a moſt merciful law; and why it ſhould not yet be in force being wholly as needful, I know not what can be in cauſe but ſenſeleſs cruelty. But yet to ſay, divorce was granted for relief of wives rather than of huſbands, is but weakly conjectured, and is manifeſtly the extreme ſhift of a huddled expoſition. Whenas it could not be found how hardneſs of heart ſhould be leſſened by liberty of divorce, a fancy was deviſed to hide the flaw, by commenting that divorce was permitted only for the help of wives. Palpably uxorious! who can be ignorant that woman was created for man, and not man for woman, and that a huſband may be injured as inſufferably in marriage as a wife? What an injury is it after wedlock not to be beloved? what to be ſlighted? what to be contended with in point of houſe-rule who ſhall be the head; not for any parity of wiſdom, for that were ſomething reaſonable, but out of a female pride? ‘I ſuffer not,’ ſaith St. Paul, ‘the woman to uſurp authority over the man.’ If the apoſtle could not ſuffer it, into what mould is he mortified that can? Solomon ſaith, ‘That a bad wife is to her huſband as rottenneſs to his bones, a continual dropping. Better dwell in the corner of a houſe-top, or in the wilderneſs,’ than with ſuch an one. ‘Whoſo hideth her, hideth the wind, and one of the four miſchiefs which the earth cannot bear.’ If the ſpirit of God wrote ſuch aggravations as theſe, and (as may be gueſt by theſe ſimilitudes) counſels the man rather to divorce than to live with ſuch a colleague; and yet on the other ſide expreſſes nothing of

of the wife's suffering with a bad husband: Is it not most likely that God in his law had more pity towards man thus wedlocked, than towards the woman that was created for another? The same spirit relates to us the course which the Medes and Persians took by occasion of Vashti, whose meer denial to come at her husband's sending, lost her the being queen any longer, and set up a wholesome law, 'that every man should bear rule in his own house.' And the divine relater shews us not the least sign of disliking what was done; how should he, if Moses long before was nothing less mindful of the honour and pre-eminence due to man? So that to say divorce was granted for woman rather than man, was but fondly invented. Esteeming therefore to have asserted thus an injured law of Moses, from the unwarranted and guilty name of a dispensation, to be again a most equal and requisite law, we have the word of Christ himself, that he came not to alter the least tittle of it; and signifies no small displeasure against him that shall teach to do so. On which relying, I shall not much waver to affirm, that those words which are made to intimate as if they forbade all divorce, but for adultery, (though Moses have constituted otherwise) those words taken circumspectly, without regard to any precedent law of Moses, or attestation of Christ himself, or without care to preserve those his fundamental and superior laws of nature and charity, to which all other ordinances give up their seal, are as much against plain equity and the mercy of religion, as those words of 'Take, eat, this is my Body,' elementally understood, are against nature and sense.

And surely the restoring of this degraded law hath well recompensed the diligence was used by enlightening us further to find out wherefore Christ took off the Pharisees from alledging the law, and referred them to the first institution; not condemning, altering, or abolishing this precept of divorce, which is plainly moral, for that were against his truth, his promise, and his prophetic office; but knowing how fallaciously they had cited and concealed the particular and natural reason of the law that they might justify any froward reason of their own, he lets go that sophistry unconvinced; for that had been to teach them else, which his purpose was not. And since they had taken a liberty which the law gave not, he amuses and repels their tempting pride with a perfection of paradise, which the law required not; not thereby to oblige our performance to that whereto the law never enjoined the fallen estate of man: for if the first institution must make wedlock, whatever happen, inseparable to us, it must make it also as perfect, as meetly helpful, and as comfortable as God promised it should be, at least in some degree; otherwise it is not equal or proportionable to the strength of man, that he should be reduced into such indissoluble bonds to his assured misery, if all the other conditions of that covenant be manifestly altered.

C H A P. XVI.

How to be understood that they must be one flesh; and how that those whom God hath joined, Man should not funder.

NEXT he saith, 'they must be one flesh;' which, when all conjecturing is done, will be found to import no more but to make legitimate and good the carnal act, which else might seem to have something of pollution in it; and infers thus much over, that the fit union of their souls be such as may even incorporate them to love and amity; but that can never be where no correspondence is of the mind; nay, instead of being one flesh, they will be rather two carcases chained unnaturally together; or, as it may happen, a living soul bound to a dead corpse; a punishment too like that inflicted by the tyrant Mezentius, so little worthy to be received as that remedy of loneliness which

God meant us. Since we know it is not the joining of another body will remove loneliness, but the uniting of another compliable mind; and that it is no blessing but a torment, nay a base and brutish condition to be one flesh, unless where nature can in some measure fix a unity of disposition. The meaning therefore of these words, 'For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave to his wife,' was first to shew us the dear affection which naturally grows in every not unnatural marriage, even to the leaving of parents, or other familiarity whatsoever. Next, it justifies a man in so doing, that nothing is done undutifully to father or mother. But he that should be here sternly commanded to cleave to his error, a disposition which to his he finds will never cement, a quotidian of sorrow and discontent in his house; let us be excused to pause a little, and bethink us every way round ere we lay such a flat solecism upon the gracious, and certainly not inexorable, not ruthless and flinty ordinance of marriage. For if the meaning of these words must be thus blocked up within their own letters from all equity and fair deduction, they will serve then well indeed their turn, who affirm divorce to have been granted only for wives; whereas we see no word of this text binds women, but men only, what it binds. No marvel then if Salomith (Sister to Herod) sent a writ of ease to Costobarus her husband, which (as Josephus there attests) was lawful only to men. No marvel though Placidia, the sister of Honorius, threatned the like to earl Constantius for a trivial cause, as Photius relates from Olympiodorus. No marvel any thing, if letters must be turned into palisadoes, to stake out all requisite sense from entering to their due enlargement.

Lastly, Christ himself tells who should not be put asunder, namely, those whom God hath joined. A plain solution of this great controversy, if men would but use their eyes; for when is it that God may be said to join? when the parties and their friends consent? No surely, for that may concur to lewdest ends. Or is it when Church-rites are finished? Neither; for the efficacy of those depends upon the presupposed fitness of either party. Perhaps after carnal knowledge: least of all; for that may join persons whom neither law nor nature dares join. 'Tis left, that only then when the minds are fitly disposed and enabled to maintain a chearful conversation, to the solace and love of each other, according as God intended and promised in the very first foundation of matrimony, 'I will make him a help-meet for him;' for surely what God intended and promised, that only can be thought to be his joining, and not the contrary. So likewise the apostle witnesseth, 1 Cor. vii. 15. that in marriage 'God hath called us to peace.' And doubtless in what respect he hath called us to marriage, in that also he hath joined us. The rest, whom either disproportion or deadness of spirit, or something distasteful and averse in the immutable bent of nature renders conjugal, error may have joined, but God never joined against the meaning of his own ordinance. And if he joined them not, then is there no power above their own consent to hinder them from unjoining, when they cannot reap the soberest ends of being together in any tolerable sort. Neither can it be said properly that such twain were ever divorced, but only parted from each other, as two persons unconjunctive are unmarriageable together. But if, whom God hath made a fit help, frowardness or private injuries hath made unfit, that being the secret of marriage, God can better judge than man, neither is man indeed fit or able to decide this matter: however it be, undoubtedly a peaceful divorce is a less evil, and less in scandal than hateful, hard-hearted, and destructive continuance of marriage in the judgment of Moses and of Christ, that justifies him in chusing the less evil; which if it were an honest and civil prudence in the law, what is there in the gospel forbidding such a kind of legal wisdom, though we should admit the common expositors?

C H A P. XVII.

The sentence of Christ concerning Divorce how to be expounded.
What Grotius hath observed. Other Additions.

HAVING thus unfolded those ambiguous reasons, wherewith Christ (as his wont was) gave to the Pharisees that came to sound him such an answer as they deserved, it will not be uneasy to explain the sentence itself that now follows; 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery.' First therefore I will set down what is observed by Grotius upon this point, a man of general learning. Next, I produce what mine own thoughts gave me before I had seen his annotations. Origen, saith he, notes that Christ named adultery rather as one example of other like cases, than as one only exception; and that is frequent not only in human but in divine laws, to express one kind of fact, whereby other causes of like nature may have the like plea, as Exod. xxi. 18, 19, 20, 26. Deut. xix. 5. And from the maxims of civil law he shews, that even in sharpest penal laws the same reason hath the same right; and in gentler laws, that from like causes to like the law interprets rightly. But it may be objected, saith he, that nothing destroys the end of wedlock so much as adultery. To which he answers, that marriage was not ordained only for copulation, but for mutual help and comfort of life: and if we mark diligently the nature of our Saviour's commands, we shall find that both their beginning and their end consists in charity; whose will is that we should so be good to others, as that we be not cruel to ourselves: and hence it appears why Mark and Luke, and St. Paul to the Corinthians, mentioning this precept of Christ, add no exception, because exceptions that arise from natural equity are included silently under general terms: it would be considered therefore whether the same equity may not have place in other cases less frequent. Thus far he. From hence is what I add: First, that this saying of Christ, as it is usually expounded, can be no law at all, that a man for no cause should separate but for adultery, except it be a supernatural law, not binding us as we now are; had it been the law of nature, either the Jews, or some other wise and civil nation would have pressed it: or let it be so, yet that law, Deut. xxiv. 1. whereby a man hath leave to part, whenas for just and natural cause discovered he cannot love, is a law ancients and deeper engraven in blameless nature than the other: therefore the inspired law-giver Moses took care that this should be specified and allowed, the other he let vanish in silence, not once repeated in the volume of his law, even as the reason of it vanished with paradise. Secondly, this can be no new command, for the gospel enjoins no new morality, save only the infinite enlargement of charity, which in this respect is called the new Commandment by St. John, as being the accomplishment of every command. Thirdly, it is no command of perfection further than it partakes of charity, which is, 'the bond of perfection.' Those commands therefore which compel us to self-cruelty above our strength, so hardly will help forward to perfection, that they hinder and set backward in all the common rudiments of christianity, as was proved. It being thus clear that the words of Christ can be no kind of command as they are vulgarly taken, we shall now see in what sense they may be a command, and that an excellent one, the same with that of Moses, and no other. Moses had granted, that only for a natural annoyance, defect, or dislike, whether in body or mind, (for so the Hebrew word plainly notes) which a man could not force himself to live with, he might give a bill of divorce, thereby forbidding any other cause wherein amendment or reconciliation might have place. This law the Pharisees depraving, extended to any slight contentious cause

whatsoever. Christ therefore seeing where they halted, urges the negative part of the law, which is necessarily understood (for the determinate permission of Moses binds them from further licence) and checking their supercilious drift, declares that no accidental, temporary, or reconcilable offence (except fornication) can justify a divorce. He touches not here those natural and perpetual hindrances of **society**, whether in body or mind, which are not to be removed; for such as they are aptest to **cause an unchangeable offence**, so are they not capable of reconciliation, because not of amendment: they do not break indeed, but they annihilate the bands of marriage more than adultery. For that fault committed argues not always a hatred either natural or incidental against whom it is committed; neither does it infer a disability of all future helpfulness, or loyalty, or loving agreement, being once past and pardoned, where it can be pardoned: but that which naturally distastes, and 'finds no favour in the eyes' of matrimony, can never be concealed, never appeased, never intermitted, but proves a perpetual nullity of love and contentment, a solitude and dead vacation of all acceptable conversing. Moses therefore permits divorce, but in cases only that have no hands to join, and more need separating than adultery. Christ forbids it, but in matters only that may accord, and those less than fornication. Thus is Moses law here plainly confirmed, and those causes which he permitted not a jot gainsaid. And that this is the true meaning of this place I prove by no less an author than St. Paul himself, 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11. upon which text interpreters agree, that the apostle only repeats the precept of Christ: where while he speaks of the 'wife's reconciliation to her husband,' he puts it out of controversy, that our Saviour meant chiefly matters of strife and reconciliation; of which sort he would not that any difference should be the occasion of divorce, except fornication. And that we may learn better how to value a grave and prudent law of Moses, and how unadvisedly we smatter with our lips, when we talk of Christ's abolishing any judicial law of his great father, except in some circumstances which are judaical rather than judicial, and need no abolishing, but cease of themselves; I say again, that this recited Law of Moses contains a cause of divorce greater beyond compare than that for adultery: and who so cannot so conceive it, errs and wrongs exceedingly a law of deep wisdom for want of well fathoming. For let him mark, no man urges the just divorcing of adultery as it is a sin, but as it is an injury to marriage; and though it be but once committed, and that without malice, whether through importunity or opportunity, the gospel does not therefore dissuade him who would therefore divorce; but that natural hatred, whenever it arises, is a greater evil in marriage than the accident of adultery, a greater defrauding, a greater injustice, and yet not blameable, he who understands not after all this representing, I doubt his will like a hard spleen draws faster than his understanding can well sanguify: Nor did that man ever know or feel what it is to love truly, nor ever yet comprehended in his thoughts what the true intent of marriage is. And this also will be somewhat above his reach, but yet no less a truth for lack of his perspective, that as no man apprehends what vice is so well as he who is truly virtuous, no man knows Hell like him who converses most in Heaven; so there is none that can estimate the evil and the affliction of a natural hatred in matrimony, unless he have a soul gentle enough and spacious enough to contemplate what is true love.

And the reason why men so disesteem this wise-judging law of God, and count hate, or 'the not finding of favour,' as it is there termed, a humorous, a dishonest, and slight cause of divorce, is because themselves apprehend so little of what true concord means: for if they did, they would be juster in their balancing between natural hatred and casual adultery; this being but a transient injury, and soon amended, I mean as to the party against whom the trespass is: but that other being an unspeakable and unremitting sorrow and offence, whereof no amends can be made, no cure, no ceasing but by divorce, which like a divine touch in one moment heals all, and (like the word of God) in one instant hushes outrageous tempests into a sudden stillness and peaceful calm. Yet all this so

great a good of God's own enlarging to us, is by the hard reins of them that fit us, wholly diverted and imbezelled from us. Maligners of mankind! But who hath taught you to mangle thus, and make more gashes in the miseries of a blameless creature, with the leaden daggers of your literal decrees, to whose ease you cannot add the tithe of one small atom, but by letting alone your unhelpful surgery. As for such as think wandering concupiscence to be here newly and more precisely forbidden than it was before; if the apostle can convince them, we know that we are to 'know lust by the law,' and not by any new discovery of the gospel. The law of Moses knew what it permitted, and the gospel knew what it forbid; he that under a peevish conceit of debarring concupiscence, shall go about to make a novice of Moses, (not to say a worse thing, for reverence sake) and such a one of God himself as is a horror to think, to bind our Saviour in the default of a downright promise-breaking, and to bind the disunions of complaining nature, in chains together, and curb them with a canon bit; it is he that commits all the whoredom and adultery which himself adjudges, besides the former guilt so manifold that lies upon him. And if none of these considerations, with all their weight and gravity, can avail to the dispossessing him of his precious literalism, let some one or other entreat him but to read on in the same xixth of Matth. till he come to that place that says, 'Some make themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of Heaven's sake.' And if then he please to make use of Origen's knife, he may do well to be his own carver.

C H A P. XVIII.

Whether the words of our Saviour be rightly expounded only of actual fornication to be the cause of Divorce. The opinion of Grotius, with other reasons.

BUT because we know that Christ never gave a judicial law, and that the word Fornication is variously significant in scripture, it will be much right done to our Saviour's words, to consider diligently whether it be meant here that nothing but actual fornication proved by witness can warrant a divorce; for so our canon law judges. Nevertheless, as I find that Grotius on this place hath observed the Christian emperors, Theodosius the II^d and Justinian, men of high wisdom and reputed piety, decreed it to be a divorcive fornication, if the wife attempted either against the knowledge, or obstinately against the will of her husband, such things as gave open suspicion of adulterizing, as the wilful haunting of feasts, and invitations with men not of her near kindred, the lying forth of her house, without probable cause, the frequenting of theatres against her husband's mind, her endeavour to prevent or destroy conception. Hence that of Jerom, 'where fornication is suspected, the wife may lawfully be divorced:' not that every motion of a jealous mind should be regarded, but that it should not be exacted to prove all things by the visibility of law witnessing, or else to hood-wink the mind: for the law is not able to judge of these things but by the rule of equity, and by permitting a wife man to walk the middle way of prudent circumspection, neither wretchedly jealous, nor stupidly and tamely patient. To this purpose hath Grotius in his notes. He shews also that fornication is taken in scripture for such a continual headstrong behaviour, as tends to plain contempt of the husband, and proves it out of Judges xix. 2. where the Levite's wife is said to have played the whore against him; which Josephus and the Septuagint, with the Chaldean, interpret only of stubbornness and rebellion against her husband: and to this I add, that Kimchi, and the two other rabbies who gloss the text, are in the same opinion. Ben Gersom reasons, that had it been

been whoredom, a Jew and a Levite would have disdained to fetch her again. And this I shall contribute, that had it been whoredom, she would have chosen any other place to run to than to her father's house, it being so infamous for an Hebrew woman to play the harlot, and so opprobrious to the parents. Fornication then in this place of the Judges is understood for stubborn disobedience against the husband, and not for adultery. A sin of that sudden activity, as to be already committed when no more is done, but only looked unchastely : which yet I should be loth to judge worthy a divorce, though in our Saviour's language it be called adultery. Nevertheless when palpable and frequent signs are given, the law of God, Numb. v. so far gave way to the jealousy of a man, as that the woman, set before the sanctuary with her head uncovered, was adjured by the priest to swear whether she were false or no, and constrained to drink that ' bitter water ' with an undoubted ' curse of rottenness and tympany ' to follow, unless she were innocent. And the jealous man had not been guiltless before God, as seems by the last verse, if having such a suspicion in his head, he should neglect his trial ; which if to this day it be not to be used, or be thought as uncertain of effect as our antiquated law of Ordalium, yet all equity will judge that many adulterous demeanours, which are of lewd suspicion and example, may be held sufficient to incur a divorce, though the act itself hath not been proved. And seeing the generosity of our nation is so, as to account no reproach more abominable than to be nick-named the husband of an adulteress ; that our law should not be as ample as the law of God, to vindicate a man from that ignoble suffering, is our barbarous unskilfulness, not considering that the law should be exasperated according to our estimation of the injury. And if it must be suffered till the act be visibly proved, Solomon himself, whose judgment will be granted to surpass the acuteness of any canonist, confesses, Prov. xxx. 19, 20. that for the act of adultery it is as difficult to be found as the ' track of an eagle in the air, or the way of a ship in the sea ; ' so that a man may be put to unmanly indignities ere it be found out. This therefore may be enough to inform us, that divorcive adultery is not limited by our Saviour to the utmost act, and that to be attested always by eye-witness, but may be extended also to divers obvious actions, which either plainly lead to adultery, or give such presumption whereby sensible men may suspect the deed to be already done. And this the rather may be thought, in that our Saviour chose to use the word Fornication, which word is found to signify other matrimonial transgressions of main breach to that covenant besides actual adultery. For that sin needed not the riddance of divorce, but of death by the law, which was active even till then by the example of the woman taken in adultery ; or if the law had been dormant, our Saviour was more likely to have told them of their neglect, than to have let a capital crime silently scape into a divorce : or if it be said, his business was not to tell them what was criminal in the civil courts, but what was sinful at the bar of conscience, how dare they then, having no other ground than these our Saviour's words, draw that into the trial of law, which both by Moses and our Saviour was left to the jurisdiction of conscience ? But we take from our Saviour, say they, only that it was adultery, and our law of itself applies the punishment. But by their leave that so argue, the great Law-giver of all the world, who knew best what was adultery, both to the Jew and to the Gentile, appointed no such applying, and never likes when mortal men will be vainly presuming to outstrip his justice.

C H A P. XIX.

Christ's manner of teaching. St. Paul adds to this matter of divorce without command, to shew the matter to be of equity, not of rigour. That the bondage of a Christian may be as much, and his peace as little, in some other marriages besides idolatrous. If those arguments therefore be good in that one case, why not in those other? Therefore the Apostle himself adds
ἐν τοῖς τοιαύτοις.

THUS at length we see both by this and other places, that there is scarce any one saying in the gospel but must be read with limitations and distinctions to be rightly understood; for Christ gives no full comments or continued discourses, but (as Demetrius the rhetorician phrases it) speaks oft in monosyllables, like a master scattering the heavenly grain of his doctrine like pearls here and there, which requires a skilful and laborious gatherer, who must compare the words he finds with other precepts, with the end of every ordinance, and with the general analogy of evangelic doctrine: otherwise many particular sayings would be but strange repugnant riddles, and the Church would offend in granting divorce for frigidity, which is not here excepted with adultery, but by them added. And this was it undoubtedly, which gave reason to St. Paul of his own authority, as he professes, and without command from the lord, to enlarge the seeming construction of those places in the gospel, by adding a case wherein a person deserted, (which is something less than divorced) may lawfully marry again. And having declared his opinion in one case, he leaves a further liberty for Christian prudence to determine in cases of like importance, using words so plain as not to be shifted off, 'that a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases;' adding also, that 'God hath called us to peace' in marriage.

Now if it be plain that a Christian may be brought into unworthy bondage, and his religious peace not only interrupted now and then, but perpetually and finally hindered in wedlock, by mis-yoking with a diversity of nature as well as of religion, the reasons of St. Paul cannot be made special to that one case of infidelity, but are of equal moment to a divorce, wherever Christian liberty and peace are without fault equally obstructed: That the ordinance which God gave to our comfort may not be pinned upon us to our undeserved thralldom, to be cooped up as it were in mockery of wedlock, to a perpetual betrothed loneliness and discontent, if nothing worse ensue. There being nought else of marriage left between such, but a displeasing and forced remedy against the sting of a brute desire: which fleshly accustoming without the soul's union and commixture of intellectual delight, as it is rather a soiling than a fulfilling of marriage-rites, so is it enough to abase the mettle of a generous spirit, and sinks him to a low and vulgar pitch of endeavour in all his actions; or, (which is worse) leaves him in a despairing plight of abject and hardened thoughts: which condition rather than a good man should fall into, a man useful in the service of God and mankind, Christ himself hath taught us to dispense with the most sacred ordinance of his worship, even for a bodily healing to dispense with that holy and speculative rest of sabbath, much more then with the erroneous observance of an ill-knotted marriage, for the sustaining of an overcharged faith and perseverance.

C H A P. XX.

The meaning of St. Paul, that 'charity believeth all things.' What is to be said to the licence which is vainly feared will grow hereby. What to those who never have done prescribing patience in this case. The Papist most severe against divorce, yet most easy to all licence. Of all the miseries in marriage God is to be cleared, and the faults to be laid on man's unjust laws.

AND tho' bad causes would take licence by this pretext, if that cannot be remedied, upon their conscience be it who shall so do. This was that hardness of heart, and abuse of a good law, which Moses was content to suffer, rather than good men should not have it at all to use needfully. And he who to run after one lost sheep left ninety nine of his own flock at random in the wilderness, would little perplex his thoughts for the obduring of nine hundred and ninety such as will daily take worse liberties, whether they have permission or not. To conclude, as without charity God hath given no commandment to men, so without it neither can men rightly believe any commandment given. For every act of true faith, as well that whereby we believe the law, as that whereby we endeavour the law, is wrought in us by charity, according to that in the divine hymn of St. Paul, 1 Cor. 13. 'Charity believeth all things;' not as if she were so credulous, which is the exposition hitherto current, for that were a trivial praise, but to teach us that charity is the high governess of our belief, and that we cannot safely assent to any precept written in the Bible, but as charity commends it to us. Which agrees with that of the same Apostle to the Eph. iv. 14, 15. where he tells us, that the way to get a sure undoubted knowledge of things, is to hold that for truth which accords most with charity. Whose unerring guidance and conduct having followed as a load-star, with all diligence and fidelity, in this question; I trust (through the help of that illuminating spirit which hath favoured me) to have done no every day's work, in asserting after many the words of Christ, with other Scriptures of great concernment, from burdensome and remorseless obscurity, tangled with manifold repugnancies, to their native lustre and consent between each other; hereby also dissolving tedious and Gordian difficulties, which have hitherto molested the Church of God, and are now decided not with the sword of Alexander, but with the immaculate hands of charity, to the unspeakable good of Christendom. And let the extreme literalist sit down now, and revolve whether this in all necessity be not the due result of our Saviour's words, or if he persist to be otherwise opinioned, let him well advise, lest thinking to gripe fast the gospel, he be found instead with the canon law in his fist: whose boisterous edicts tyrannizing the blessed ordinance of marriage into the quality of a most unnatural and unchristianly yoke, have given the flesh this advantage to hate it, and turn aside, oft-times unwillingly, to all dissolute uncleanness, even till punishment itself is weary of and overcome by the incredible frequency of trading lust and uncontrolled adulteries. Yet men whose creed is custom, I doubt not will be still endeavouring to hide the sloth of their own timorous capacities with this pretext, that for all this it is better to endure with patience and silence this affliction which God hath sent. And I agree it is true, if this be exhorted and not enjoined; but withal it will be wisely done to be as sure as may be, that what man's iniquity hath laid on be not imputed to God's sending, lest under the colour of an affected patience we detain ourselves at the gulph's mouth of many hideous temptations, not to be withstood without proper gifts, which (as Perkins well notes) God gives not ordinarily, no not to most earnest prayers.

Therefore

Therefore we pray, 'Lead us not into temptation;' a vain prayer, if having led ourselves thither, we love to stay in that perilous condition. God sends remedies as well as evils, under which he who lies and groans, that may lawfully acquit himself, is accessory to his own ruin; nor will it excuse him tho' he suffer through a sluggish fearfulness to search thoroughly what is lawful, for fear of disquieting the secure falsity of an old opinion. Who doubts not but that it may be piously said, to him who would dismiss his frigidity, Bear your trial, take it as if God would have you live this life of continence? if he exhort this, I hear him as an angel, tho' he speak without warrant; but if he would compel me, I know him for Satan. To him who divorces an adulteress, piety might say, pardon her; you may shew much mercy, you may win a soul: yet the law both of God and man leaves it freely to him; for God loves not to plow out the heart of our endeavours with over-hard and sad tasks. God delights not to make a drudge of virtue, whose actions must be all elective and unconstrained. Forced virtue is as a bolt over-shot, it goes neither forward nor backward, and does no good as it stands. Seeing therefore that neither Scripture nor reason hath laid this unjust austerity upon divorce, we may resolve that nothing else hath wrought it but that letter-bound servility of the canon doctors, supposing marriage to be a sacrament, and out of the art they have to lay unnecessary burdens upon all men, to make a fair shew in the fleshly observance of matrimony, though peace and love with all other conjugal respects fare never so ill. And indeed the papists, who are the strictest forbidders of divorce, are the easiest libertines to admit of grossest uncleanness; as if they had a design by making wedlock a supportless yoke, to violate it most, under colour of preserving it most inviolable; and withal delighting (as their mystery is) to make men the day-labourers of their own afflictions, as if there were such a scarcity of miseries from abroad, that we should be made to melt our choicest home blessings, and coin them into crosses, for want whereby to hold commerce with patience. If any therefore who shall hap to read this discourse, hath been through misadventure ill engaged in this contracted evil here complained of, and finds the fits and workings of a high impatience frequently upon him; of all those wild words which men in misery think to ease themselves by uttering, let him not open his lips against the providence of heaven, or tax the ways of God and his divine truth: for they are equal, easy, and not burdensome: nor do they ever cross the just and reasonable desires of men, nor involve this our portion of mortal life into a necessity of sadness and malecontent, by laws commanding over the unreducible antipathies of nature, sooner or later found, but allow us to remedy and shake off those evils into which human error hath led us through the midst of our best intentions, and to support our incident extremities by that authentic precept of sovereign charity, whose grand commission is to do and to dispose over all the ordinances of God to man, that love and truth may advance each other to everlasting. While we, literally superstitious, through customary faintness of heart, not venturing to pierce with our free thoughts into the full latitude of nature and religion, abandon ourselves to serve under the tyranny of usurped opinions; suffering those ordinances which were allotted to our solace and reviving, to trample over us, and hale us into a multitude of sorrows, which God never meant us. And where he sets us in a fair allowance of way, with honest liberty and prudence to our guard, we never leave subtilizing and casuisting till we have straitned and pared that liberal path into a razor's edge to walk on, between a precipice of unnecessary mischief on either side; and starting at every false alarm, we do not know which way to set a foot forward with manly confidence and Christian resolution, thro' the confused ringing in our ears of panic scruples and amazements.

C H A P. XXI.

That the matter of divorce is not to be tried by law, but by conscience, as many other sins are. The magistrate can only see that the condition of divorce be just and equal. The opinion of Fagius, and the reasons of this assertion.

ANother act of papal encroachment it was, to pluck the power and arbitrement of divorce from the master of the family, into whose hands God and the law of all nations had put it, and Christ so left it, preaching only to the conscience, and not authorizing a judicial court to toss about and divulge the unaccountable and secret reason of disaffection between man and wife, as a thing most improperly answerable to any such kind of trial. But the Popes of Rome, perceiving the great revenue and high authority it would give them even over princes, to have the judging and deciding of such a main consequence in the life of man as was divorce; wrought so upon the superstition of those ages, as to divest them of that right which God from the beginning had entrusted to the husband: by which means they subjected that ancient and naturally domestic prerogative to an external and unbefitting judicature. For although differences in divorce about dowries, jointures, and the like, besides the punishing of adultery, ought not to pass without referring, if need be, to the magistrate; yet that the absolute and final hindring of divorce cannot belong to any civil or earthly power, against the will and consent of both parties, or of the husband alone, some reasons will be here urged as shall not need to decline the touch. But first I shall recite what hath been already yielded by others in favour of this opinion. Grotius and many more agree, that notwithstanding what Christ spake therein to the conscience, the magistrate is not thereby enjoined aught against the preservation of civil peace, of equity, and of convenience. And among these Fagius is most remarkable, and gives the same liberty of pronouncing divorce to the Christian magistrate as the Mosaic had. "For whatever (saith he) Christ spake to the regenerate, the judge hath to deal with the vulgar: if therefore any through hardness of heart will not be a tolerable wife to her husband, it will be lawful as well now as of old to pass the bill of divorce, not by private, but by public authority. Nor doth man separate them then, but God by his law of divorce given by Moses. What can hinder the magistrate from so doing, to whose government all outward things are subject, to separate and remove from perpetual vexation, and no small danger, those bodies whose minds are already separate; it being his office to procure peaceable and convenient living in the commonwealth; and being as certain also, that they so necessarily separated cannot all receive a single life?" And this I observe, that our divines do generally condemn separation of bed and board, without the liberty of second choice: if that therefore in some cases be most purely necessary, (as who so blockish to deny?) then is this also as needful. Thus far by others is already well stept, to inform us that divorce is not a matter of law, but of charity: if there remain a furlong yet to end the question, these following reasons may serve to gain it with any apprehension not too unlearned or too wayward. First, because oft-times the causes of seeking divorce reside so deeply in the radical and innocent affections of nature, as is not within the diocese of law to tamper with. Other relations may aptly enough be held together by a civil and virtuous love: but the duties of man and wife are such as are chiefly conversant in that love, which is most ancient and meerly natural, whose two prime statutes are to join itself to that which is good, and acceptable, and friendly; and to turn aside and depart from what is disagreeable, displeasing, and unlike: of the two this latter is the strongest, and most equal to be regarded:

garded : for although a man may often be unjust in seeking that which he loves, yet he can never be unjust or blameable in retiring from his endless trouble and distaste, whenas his tarrying can redound to no true content on either side. Hate is of all things the mightiest divider, nay is division itself. To couple hatred therefore, though wedlock try all her golden links, and borrow to her aid all the iron manacles and fetters of law, it does but seek to twist a rope of sand, which was a task they say that posed the devil : and that sluggish fiend in hell, Ocnus, whom the poems tell of, brought his idle cordage to as good effect, which never served to bind with, but to feed the ass that stood at his elbow. And that the restrictive law against divorce attains as little to bind any thing truly in a disjointed marriage, or to keep it bound, but serves only to feed the ignorance and definitive impertinence of a doltish canon, were no absurd allusion. To hinder therefore those deep and serious regresses of nature in a reasonable soul, parting from that mistaken help which he justly seeks in a person created for him, recollecting himself from an unmeet help which was never meant, and to detain him by compulsion in such an unpredestined misery as this, is in diameter against both nature and institution : but to interpose a jurisdictional power over the inward and irremediable disposition of man, to command love and sympathy, to forbid dislike against the guiltless instinct of nature, is not within the province of any law to reach ; and were indeed an uncommodious rudeness, not a just power : for that law may bandy with nature, and traverse her sage motions, was an error in Callicles the rhetorician, whom Socrates from high principles confutes in Plato's Gorgias. If therefore divorce may be so natural, and that law and nature are not to go contrary ; then to forbid divorce compulsively, is not only against nature, but against law.

Next, it must be remembred that all law is for some good that may be frequently attained without the admixture of a worse inconvenience ; and therefore many gross faults, as ingratitude and the like, which are too far within the soul to be cured by constraint of law, are left only to be wrought on by conscience and persuasion. Which made Aristotle, in the 10th of his Ethics to Nicomachus, aim at a kind of division of law into private or persuasive, and public or compulsive. Hence it is that the law forbidding divorce, never attains to any good end of such prohibition, but rather multiplies evil. For if nature's resistless sway in love or hate be once compelled, it grows careless of itself, vicious, useless to friends, unserviceable and spiritless to the commonwealth. Which Moses rightly foresaw, and all wise lawgivers that ever knew man, what kind of creature he was. The Parliament also and clergy of England were not ignorant of this, when they consented that Harry the VIII. might put away his Queen Anne of Cleve, whom he could not like after he had been wedded half a year ; unless it were that, contrary to the proverb, they made a necessity of that which might have been a virtue in them to do : for even the freedom and eminence of man's creation gives him to be a law in this matter to himself, being the head of the other sex which was made for him ; whom therefore though he ought not to injure, yet neither should he be forced to retain in society to his own overthrow, nor to hear any Judge therein above himself. It being also an unseemly affront to the sequestred and veiled modesty of that sex, to have her unpleasingness and other concealments bandied up and down, and aggravated in open court by those hired masters of tongue-fence. Such uncomely exigencies it befel no less a majesty than Henry the VIII. to be reduced to, who finding just reason in his conscience to forego his brother's wife, after many indignities of being deluded, and made a boy of by those his two cardinal judges, was constrained at last, for want of other proof, that she had been carnally known by Prince Arthur, even to uncover the nakedness of that virtuous lady, and to recite openly the obscene evidence of his brother's chamberlain. Yet it pleased God to make him see all the tyranny of Rome, by discovering this which they exercised over divorce, and to make him the beginner of a reformation to this whole kingdom, by first asserting into his familiar power the right of just divorce. 'Tis true, an adulter-

refs cannot be shamed enough by any public proceeding; but the woman whose honour is not appeached, is less injured by a silent dismissal, being otherwise not illiberally dealt with, than to endure a clamouring debate of utterless things, in a business of that civil secrecy and difficult discerning, as not to be over-much questioned by nearest friends. Which drew that answer from the greatest and worthiest Roman of his time, Paulus Emilius, being demanded why he would put away his wife for no visible reason? 'This shoe (said he, and held it out on his foot) 'is a neat shoe, a new shoe, and yet none of you know where it wrings me : ' much less by the unfamiliar cognizance of a fee'd gamester can such a private difference be examined, neither ought it.

Again, if law aim at the firm establishment and preservation of matrimonial faith, we know that cannot thrive under violent means, but is the more violated. It is not when two unfortunately met, are by the canon forced to draw in that yoke an unmerciful day's work of sorrow till death unharness them, that then the law keeps marriage most unviolated and unbroken; but when the law takes order that marriage be accountant and responsible to perform that society, whether it be religious, civil, or corporal, which may be conscionably required and claimed therein, or else to be dissolved if it cannot be undergone. This is to make marriage most indissoluble, by making it a just and equal dealer, a performer of those due helps which instituted the covenant; being otherwise a most unjust contract, and no more to be maintained under tuition of law than the vilest fraud, or cheat, or theft that may be committed. But because this is such a secret kind of fraud or theft, as cannot be discerned by law, but only by the plaintiff himself; therefore to divorce was never counted a political or civil offence neither to Jew nor Gentile, nor by any judicial intendment of Christ, further than could be discerned to transgress the allowance of Moses, which was of necessity so large, that it doth all one as if it sent back the matter undeterminable at law, and intractable by rough dealing, to have instructions and admonitions bestowed about it by them whose spiritual office is to adjure and to denounce, and so left to the conscience. The law can only appoint the just and equal conditions of divorce, and is to look how it is an injury to the divorced, which in truth it can be none, as a mere separation; for if she consent, wherein has the law to right her? or consent not, then is it either just, and so deserved; or if unjust, such in all likelihood was the divorcer: and to part from an unjust man is a happiness, and no injury to be lamented. But suppose it to be an injury, the law is not able to amend it, unless she think it other than a miserable redress to return back from whence she was expelled, or but intreated to be gone, or else to live apart still married without marriage, a married widow. Last, if it be to chasten the divorcer, what law punishes a deed which is not moral but natural, a deed which cannot certainly be found to be an injury? or how can it be punished by prohibiting the divorce, but that the innocent must equally partake both in the shame and in the smart? So that which way soever we look, the law can to no rational purpose forbid divorce, it can only take care that the conditions of divorce be not injurious. Thus then we see the trial of law how impertinent it is to this question of divorce, how helpless next, and then how hurtful.

C H A P. XXII.

The last reason why divorce is not to be restrained by law, it being against the law of nature and of nations. The larger proof whereof referred to Mr. Selden's book, "*De Jure Naturali & Gentium*." An objection of Paræus answered. How it ought to be ordered by the Church. That this will not breed any worse inconvenience, nor so bad as is now suffered.

Therefore the last reason why it should not be, is the example we have, not only from the noblest and wisest commonwealths, guided by the clearest light of human knowledge, but also from the divine testimonies of God himself, lawgiving in person to a sanctified people. That all this is true, who so desires to know at large with least pains, and expects not here over-long rehearsals of that which is by others already so judiciously gathered; let him hasten to be acquainted with that noble volume written by our learned Selden, '*Of the law of nature and of nations*,' a work more useful and more worthy to be perused by whosoever studies to be a great man in wisdom, equity, and justice, than all those '*decretals and sumless sums*,' which the Pontifical Clerks have doted on, ever since that unfortunate mother famously sinned thrice, and died impenitent of her bringing into the world those two misbegotten infants, and for ever infants, Lombard and Gratian, him the compiler of canon iniquity, t'other the Tubalcain of scholastic sophistry, whose overspreading barbarism hath not only infused their own bastardy upon the fruitfulest part of human learning, not only dissipated and dejected the clear light of nature in us, and of nations, but hath tainted also the fountains of divine doctrine, and rendered the pure and solid law of God unbeneficial to us by their calumnious dunceries. Yet this law which their unskilfulness hath made liable to all ignominy, the purity and wisdom of this law shall be the buckler of our dispute. Liberty of divorce we claim not, we think not but from this law; the dignity, the faith, the authority thereof is now grown among Christians, O astonishment! a labour of no mean difficulty and envy to defend. That it should not be counted a faltering dispense, a flattering permission of sin, the bill of adultery, a snare, is the expence of all this apology. And all that we solicit is, that it may be suffered to stand in the place where God set it, amidst the firmament of his holy laws, to shine, as it was wont, upon the weaknesses and errors of men, perishing else in the sincerity of their honest purposes: for certain there is no memory of whoredoms and adulteries left among us now, when this warranted freedom of God's own giving is made dangerous and discarded for a scrole of licence. It must be your suffrages and votes, O Englishmen, that this exploded decree of God and Moses may scape and come off fair, without the censure of a shameful abrogating: which, if yonder sun ride sure, and means not to break word with us to-morrow, was never yet abrogated by our Saviour. Give sentence if you please, that the frivolous canon may reverse the infallible judgment of Moses and his great director. Or if it be the reformed writers whose doctrine persuades this rather, their reasons I dare affirm are all silenced, unless it be only this. Paræus on the Corinthians would prove that hardness of heart in divorce is no more now to be permitted, but to be amerced with fine and imprisonment. I am not willing to discover the forgettings of reverend men, yet here I must: What article or clause of the whole new covenant can Paræus bring to exasperate the judicial law, upon any infirmity under the gospel? I say infirmity, for if it were the high hand of sin, the law as little would have endured it as the gospel; it would not stretch to the

dividing;

dividing of an inheritance; it refused to condemn adultery, not that these things should not be done at law, but to shew that the gospel hath not the least influence upon judicial courts, much less to make them sharper and more heavy, least of all to arraign before a temporal judge that which the law without summons acquitted. 'But (saith he) the law was the time of youth, under violent affections; the gospel in us is mature age, and ought to subdue affections.' True, and so ought the law too, if they be found inordinate, and not merely natural and blameless. Next I distinguish, that the time of the law is compared to youth and pupillage in respect of the ceremonial part, which led the Jews as children through corporal and garish rudiments, until the fulness of time should reveal to them the higher lessons of faith and redemption. This is not meant of the moral part, therein it soberly concerned them not to be babies, but to be men in good earnest: the sad and awful majesty of that law was not to be jested with: to bring a bearded nonage with lascivious dispensations before that throne, had been a lewd affront, as it is now a gross mistake. But what discipline is this, Paræus, to nourish violent affections in youth, by cockering and wanton indulgencies, and to chastise them in mature age with a boyish rod of correction? How much more coherent is it to Scripture, that the law as a strict schoolmaster should have punished every trespass without indulgence so baneful to youth, and that the gospel should now correct that by admonition and reproof only, in free and mature age, which was punished with stripes in the childhood and bondage of the law? What therefore it allowed then so fairly, much less is to be whipped now, especially in penal courts: and if it ought now to trouble the conscience, why did that angry accuser and condemner law reprieve it? So then, neither from Moses nor from Christ hath the magistrate any authority to proceed against it. But what, shall then the disposal of that power return again to the master of a family? Wherefore not, since God there put it, and the presumptuous canon thence bereft it? This only must be provided, that the ancient manner be observed in the presence of the minister and other grave selected elders, who after they shall have admonished and pressed upon him the words of our Saviour, and he shall have protested in the faith of the eternal gospel, and the hope he has of happy resurrection, that otherwise than thus he cannot do, and thinks himself and this his case not contained in that prohibition of divorce which Christ pronounced, the matter not being of malice, but of nature, and so not capable of reconciling; to constrain him further were to unchristen him, to unman him, to throw the mountain of Sinai upon him, with the weight of the whole law to boot, flat against the liberty and essence of the gospel; and yet nothing available either to the sanctity of marriage, the good of husband, wife, or children, nothing profitable either to church or commonwealth, but hurtful and pernicious in all these respects. But this will bring in confusion: yet these cautious mistrusters might consider, that what they thus object lights not upon this book, but upon that which I engage against them, the book of God and Moses, with all the wisdom and providence which had forecast the worst of confusion that could succeed, and yet thought fit of such a permission. But let them be of good cheer, it wrought so little disorder among the Jews, that from Moses till after the captivity, not one of the prophets thought it worth the rebuking; for that of Malachy well looked into will appear to be not against divorcing, but rather against keeping strange concubines, to the vexation of their Hebrew wives. If therefore we christians may be thought as good and tractable as the Jews were, (and certainly the prohibitors of divorce presume us to be better,) then less confusion is to be feared for this among us than was among them. If we be worse, or but as bad, which lamentable examples confirm we are, then have we more, or at least as much, need of this permitted law, as they to whom God therefore gave it (as they say) under a harsher covenant. Let not therefore the frailty of man go on thus inventing needless troubles to itself, to groan under the false imagination of a strictness never imposed from above; enjoining that for duty which is an impossible and vain supererogating. 'Be not righteous overmuch, is the counsel of Ecclesiastes; why shouldst thou destroy thy-

thyself?' Let us not be thus over-curious to strain at atoms, and yet to stop every vent and cranny of permissive liberty, lest nature wanting those needful pores and breathing-places which God hath not debarred our weakness, either suddenly break out into some wide rupture of open vice and frantic Heresy, or else inwardly fester with repining and blasphemous thoughts, under an unreasonable and fruitless rigour of unwarranted law. Against which evils nothing can more beseem the religion of the church, or the wisdom of the state, than to consider timely and provide. And in so doing let them not doubt but they shall vindicate the misreputed honour of God and his great law-giver, by suffering him to give his own laws according to the condition of man's nature best known to him, without the unsufferable imputation of dispensing legally with many ages of ratified adultery. They shall recover the misattended words of Christ to the sincerity of their true sense from manifold contradictions, and shall open them with the key of charity. Many helpless christians they shall raise from the depth of sadness and distress, utterly unfitted as they are to serve God or man: many they shall reclaim from obscure and giddy sects, many regain from dissolute and brutish licence, many from desperate hardness, if ever that were justly pleaded. They shall set free many daughters of Israel, not wanting much of her sad plight whom 'Satan had bound eighteen years.' Man they shall restore to his just dignity and prerogative in nature, preferring the soul's free peace before the promiscuous draining of a carnal rage. Marriage from a perilous hazard and snare, they shall reduce to be a more certain haven and retirement of happy society; when they shall judge according to God and Moses, (and how not then according to Christ) when they shall judge it more wisdom and goodness to break that covenant seemingly, and keep it really, than by compulsion of law to keep it seemingly, and by compulsion of blameless nature to break it really, at least if it were ever truly joined. The vigour of discipline they may then turn with better success upon the prostitute looseness of the times, when men finding in themselves the infirmities of former ages, shall not be constrained above the gift of God in them, to unprofitable and impossible observances, never required from the civilest, the wisest, the holiest nations, whose other excellencies in moral virtue they never yet could equal. Last of all, to those whose mind is still to maintain textual restrictions, whereof the bare sound cannot consist sometimes with humanity, much less with charity; I would ever answer, by putting them in remembrance of a command above all commands, which they seem to have forgot, and who spake it: in comparison whereof, this which they so exalt is but a petty and subordinate precept. 'Let them go' therefore with whom I am loth to couple them, yet they will needs run into the same blindness with the Pharisees; "let them go therefore" and consider well what this lesson means, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice;' for on that 'saying all the law and prophets depend,' much more the gospel; whose end and excellence is mercy and peace. Or if they cannot learn that, how will they hear this? which yet I shall not doubt to leave with them as a conclusion, That God the Son hath put all other things under his own feet, but his commandments he hath left all under the feet of charity.

The Judgment of MARTIN BUCER,
CONCERNING
D I V O R C E :

WRITTEN

To EDWARD the Sixth, in his Second Book of the Kingdom
of CHRIST.

And now ENGLISHED.

Wherein a late Book, restoring the ' Doctrine and discipline of Divorce,' is here
confirmed and justified by the authority of MARTIN BUCER.

To the Parliament of ENGLAND.

JOHN iii. 10. ' Art thou a Teacher of Israel, and knowest not these Things ?'

Published by AUTHORITY.

Testimonies of the high approbation which learned men have given
of MARTIN BUCER.

Simon Grinæus, 1533.

AMong all the Germans, I give the palm to Bucer for excellence in the scriptures.
Melancton in human learning is wondrous fluent ; but greater knowledge in the
scripture, I attribute to Bucer, and speak it unfeignedly.

John Calvin 1539.

Martin Bucer, a most faithful doctor of the church of Christ, besides his rare learning,
and copious knowledge of many things, besides his clearness of wit, much reading, and
other many and various virtues, wherein he is almost by none now living excelled, hath
few equals, and excels most ; hath this praise peculiar to himself, that none in this age
hath used exacter diligence in the exposition of scripture.

And a little beneath.

Bucer is more large than to be read by over-busied men, and too high to be easily
understood by unattentive men, and of a low capacity.

Sir

Sir John Cheek, Tutor to King Edward VI. 1551.

We have lost our master, than whom the world scarce held a greater, whether we consider his knowledge of true religion, or his integrity and innocence of life, or his incessant study of holy things, or his matchless labour of promoting piety, or his authority and amplitude of teaching, or whatever else was praise-worthy and glorious in him. Script. Anglican. pag. 864.

John Sturmius of Strasburgh.

No man can be ignorant what a great and constant opinion and estimation of Bucer there is in Italy, France and England. Whence the saying of Quintilian hath oft come to my mind, that he hath well profited in eloquence whom Cicero pleases. The same say I of Bucer, that he hath made no small progress in divinity, whom Bucer pleases; for in his volumes, which he wrote very many, there is the plain impression to be discerned of many great virtues, of diligence, of charity, of truth, of acuteness, of judgment, of learning. Wherein he hath a certain proper kind of writing, whereby he doth not only teach the reader, but affects him with the sweetness of his sentences, and with the manner of his arguing, which is so teaching, and so logical, that it may be perceived how learnedly he separates probable reasons from necessary, how forcibly he confirms what he has to prove, how subtilly he refutes, not with sharpness, but with truth.

Theodore Beza, on the Portraiture of M. Bucer.

This is that countenance of Bucer, the mirror of mildness tempered with gravity; to whom the city of Strasburgh owes the reformation of her church. Whose singular learning, and eminent zeal, joined with excellent wisdom, both his learned books, and public disputations in the general diets of the empire, shall witness to all ages. Him the German persecution drove into England; where honourably entertained by Edward the VIth, he was for two years chief Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, with greatest frequency and applause of all learned and pious men until his death, 1551. Bezae Icones.

Mr. Fox's Book of Martyrs, Vol. III. p. 763.

Bucer, what by writing, but chiefly by reading and preaching openly, wherein being painful in the word of God, he never spared himself, nor regarded his health, brought all men into such an admiration of him, that neither his friends could sufficiently praise him, nor his enemies in any point find fault with his singular life, and sincere doctrine. A most certain token whereof may be his sumptuous burial at Cambridge, solemnized with so great an assistance of all the university, that it was not possible to devise more to the setting out and amplifying of the same.

Dr. Pern, the Popish Vice-chancellor of Cambridge, his Adversary.

Cardinal Pool, about the fourth year of queen Mary, intending to reduce the university of Cambridge to Popery again, thought no way so effectual, as to cause the bones of Martin Bucer and Paulus Fagius, which had been four years in the grave, to be taken up and burnt openly with their books, as knowing that those two worthy men had been of greatest moment to the reformation of that place from popery, and had left such powerful seeds of their doctrine behind them, as would never die, unless the men themselves were digged up, and openly condemned for heretics by the university itself. This was put in execution, and Doctor Pern, Vice-chancellor, appointed to preach against Bucer: who among other things, laid to his charge the opinions which he held of the marriage of priests, of divorcement, and of usury. But immediately after his sermon

234 The Judgment of Martin Bucer, concerning Divorce.

or somewhat before, as the Book of Martyrs for a truth relates, Vol. III. p. 770. the said Doctor Pern smiting himself on the breast, and in manner weeping, wished with all his heart, that God would grant his soul might then presently depart, and remain with Bucer's; for he knew his life was such, that if any man's soul were worthy of Heaven, he thought Bucer's in special to be most worthy. *Histor. de Combust. Bucerii & Fagii.*

Acworth the University-Orator.

Soon after that queen Elizabeth came to the crown, this condemnation of Bucer and Fagius by the cardinal and his doctors, was solemnly repealed by the university; and the memory of those two famous men celebrated in an oration by Acworth the University-orator, which is yet extant in the Book of Martyrs, Vol. III. p. 773. and in Latin, *Scripta Anglican.* p. 936.

Nicholas Carre, a learned man; Walter Haddon, Master of the requests to queen Elizabeth; Matthew Parker, afterwards primate of England, with other eminent men, in their funeral orations and sermons, express abundantly how great a man Martin Bucer was; what an incredible loss England sustained in his death; and that with him died the hope of a perfect reformation for that age. *Ibid.*

Jacobus Verheiden of Grave, in his eulogies of famous divines.

Though the Name of Martin Luther be famous, yet thou Martin Bucer, for piety, learning, labour, care, vigilance, and writing, art not to be held inferior to Luther. Bucer was a singular instrument of God, so was Luther. By the death of this most learned and most faithful man, the church of Christ sustained a heavy loss, as Calvin witnesseth; and they who are studious of Calvin, are not ignorant how much he ascribes to Bucer; for thus he writes in a letter to Viretus: "What a manifold loss befel the church of God in the death of Bucer, as oft as I call to mind, I feel my heart almost rent asunder."

Peter Martyr Epist. to Conradus Hubertus.

He is dead, who hath overcome in many battles of the Lord. God lent us for a time this our father, and our teacher, never enough praised. Death hath divided me from a most unanimous friend, one truly according to mine own heart. My mind is overpressed with grief, insomuch that I have not power to write more. I bid thee in Christ farewell, and wish thou mayst be able to bear the loss of Bucer, better than I can bear it.

Testimonies given by learned men to Paulus Fagius, who held the same opinion with Martin Bucer, concerning divorce.

Paulus Fagius, born in the Palatinate, became most skilful in the Hebrew tongue. Being called to the ministry at Isna, he published many ancient and profitable Hebrew books, being aided in the expences by a senator of that city, as Origen sometime was by a certain rich man called Ambrosius. At length invited to Strasburgh, he there famously discharged the office of a teacher; until the same persecution drove him and Bucer into England, where he was preferred to a professor's place in Cambridge, and soon after died. *Bezæ Icones.*

Melchior Adamus writes his life among the famous German Divines.

Sleidan and Thuanus mention him with honour in their history: And Verheiden in his Eulogies.

To

To the PARLIAMENT.

THE Book which, among other great and high points of reformation, contains as a principal part thereof, this treatise here presented, supreme court of parliament! was by the famous author Martin Bucer, dedicated to Edward the VIth: whose incomparable youth doubtless had brought forth to the church of England, such a glorious manhood, had his life reached it, as would have left in the affairs of religion, nothing without an excellent pattern for us now to follow. But since the secret purpose of divine appointment hath reserved no less perhaps than the just half of such a sacred work to be accomplished in this age, and principally, as we trust, by your successful wisdom and authority, religious Lords and Commons! what wonder if I seek no other, to whose exactest judgment and review I may commend these last and worthiest labours of this renowned teacher; whom living, all the pious nobility of those reforming times, your truest and best-imitated ancestors, revered and admired. Nor was he wanting to a recompence as great as was himself; when both at many times before, and especially among his last sighs and prayers, testifying his dear and fatherly affection to the church and realm of England, he sincerely wished in the hearing of many devout men, * "that what he had in his last book written to king Edward concerning discipline, might have place in this kingdom. His hope was then, that no calamity, no confusion, or deformity would happen to the commonwealth; but otherwise he feared, lest in the midst of all this ardency to know God, yet by the neglect of discipline, our good endeavours would not succeed." These remarkable words of so godly and so eminent a man at his death, as they are related by a sufficient and well-known witness, who heard them, and inserted by Thuanus into his grave and serious history; so ought they to be chiefly considered by that nation for whose sake they were uttered, and more especially by that general council which represents the body of that nation. If therefore the book, or this part thereof, for necessary causes, be now revived and recommended to the use of this undisciplined age; it hence appears, that these reasons have not erred in the choice of a fit patronage for a discourse of such importance. But why the whole tractate is not here brought entire, but this matter of divorcement selected in particular, to prevent the full speed of some mis-interpreter, I hasten to disclose. First, it will be soon manifest to them who know what wise men should know, that the constitution and reformation of a commonwealth, if Ezra and Nehemiah did not mis-reform, is, like a building, to begin orderly from the foundation thereof, which is marriage and the family, to set right first whatever is amiss therein. How can there else grow up a race of warrantable men, while the house and home that breeds them, is troubled and disquieted under a bondage not of God's constraining with a natureless constraint (if his most righteous judgments may be our rule) but laid upon us imperiously in the worst and weakest ages of knowledge, by a canonical tyranny of stupid and malicious monks? who having rashly vowed themselves to a single life, which they could not undergo, invented new fetters to throw on matrimony, that the world thereby waxing more dissolute, they also in a general looseness might sin with more favour. Next, there being yet among many, such a strange iniquity and perverseness against all necessary divorce, while they will needs expound the words of our Saviour, not duly by comparing other places, as they must do in the resolving of a hundred other scriptures, but by persisting deadily in the abrupt and papistical way of a literal apprehension against the direct Analogy of sense, reason, law, and gospel; it therefore may well seem more than time to apply the sound and holy persuasions of this apostolic man, to that part in us, which is not yet fully dispossessed of an error as absurd, as most that we deplore in our blindest adversaries; and to let his authority and unanswerable reasons be vulgarly known, that either his name, or the force of his doctrine may work a wholesome effect. Lastly, I find it clear to be the author's intention, that this point of divorcement should be held

H h 2

and

* Nicol. Car. de obitu Bucer.

236 The Judgment of Martin Bucer, concerning Divorce.

and received as a most necessary and prime part of discipline in every Christian government. And therefore having reduced his model of reformation to fourteen heads, he bestows almost as much time about this one point of divorce, as about all the rest; which also was the judgment of his heirs and learned friends in Germany, best acquainted with his meaning; who first publishing this his book by Oporinus at Basil, (a city for learning and constancy in the true faith, honourable among the first) added a special note in the title, "that there the reader should find the doctrine of divorce handled so solidly, and so fully, as scarce the like in any writer of that age:" and with this particular commendation they doubted not to dedicate the book, as a most profitable and exquisite discourse, to Christian the III^d. a worthy and pious king of Denmark, as the author himself had done before to our Edward the VIth. Yet did not Bucer in that volume only declare what his constant opinion was herein, but also in his comment upon Matthew, written at Strasburgh divers years before, he treats distinctly and copiously the same argument in three several places; touches it also upon the vith to the Romans, and promises the same solution more largely upon the first to the Corinthians, omitting no occasion to weed out this last and deepest mischief of the canon-law, sown into the opinions of modern men, against the laws and practice both of God's chosen people, and the best primitive times. Wherein his faithfulness and powerful evidence prevailed so far with all the church of Strasburgh, that they published this doctrine of divorce, as an article of their confession, after they had taught so eight and twenty years, through all those times, when that city flourished, and excelled most, both in religion, learning, and government, under those first restorers of the gospel there, Zelius, Hedio, Capito, Fagius, and those who incomparably then governed the commonwealth, Farrerus and Sturmius. If therefore God in the former age found out a servant, and by whom he had converted and reformed many a city, by him thought good to restore the most needful doctrine of divorce from rigorous and harmful mistakes on the right hand; it can be no strange thing, if in this age he stir up by whatsoever means whom it pleases him, to take in hand and maintain the same assertion. Certainly if it be in man's discerning to sever providence from chance, I could alledge many instances, wherein there would appear cause to esteem of me no other than a passive instrument under some power and counsel higher and better than can be human, working to a general good in the whole course of this matter. For that I owe no light, or leading received from any man in the discovery of this truth, what time I first undertook it 'in the doctrine and discipline of divorce,' and had only the infallible grounds of scripture to be my guide; he who tries the inmost heart, and saw with what severe industry and examination of myself, I set down every period, will be my witness. When I had almost finished the first edition, I chanced to read in the notes of Hugo Grotius upon the vth of Matth. whom I strait understood inclining to reasonable terms in this controversy: and something he whispered rather than disputed about the law of charity, and the true end of wedloc. Glad therefore of such an able assistant, however at much distance, I resolved at length to put off into this wild and calumnious world. For God, it seems, intended to prove me, whether I durst alone take up a rightful cause against a world of disesteem, and found I durst. My name I did not publish, as not willing it should sway the reader either for me or against me. But when I was told, that the stile, which what it ails to be so soon distinguishable, I cannot tell, was known by most men, and that some of the clergy began to inveigh and exclaim on what I was credibly informed they had not read; I took it then for my proper season, both to shew them a name that could easily condemn such an indiscreet kind of censure, and to reinforce the question with a more accurate diligence: that if any of them would be so good as to leave railing, and to let us hear so much of his learning and christian wisdom, as will be strictly demanded of him in his answering to this problem, care was had he should not spend his preparations against a nameless pamphlet. By this time I had learned that Paulus Fagius, one of the chief divines in
Germany,

The Judgment of Martin Bucer, concerning Divorce. 237

Germany, sent for by Frederic the Palatine, to reform his dominion, and after that invited hither in king Edward's days, to be a Professor of divinity in Cambridge, was of the same opinion touching divorce, which these men so lavishly traduced in me. What I found, I inserted where fittest place was, thinking sure they would respect so grave an author, at least to the moderating of their odious inferences. And having now perfected a second edition, I referred the judging thereof to your high and impartial sentence, honoured Lords and Commons! For I was confident, if any thing generous, any thing noble, and above the multitude, were left yet in the spirit of England; it could be nowhere sooner found, and nowhere sooner understood, than in that house of justice and true liberty where ye sit in council. Nor doth the event hitherto, for some reasons which I shall not here deliver, fail me of what I conceived so highly. Nevertheless, being far otherwise dealt with by some, of whose profession and supposed knowledge I had better hope, and esteemed the deviser of a new and pernicious paradox; I felt no difference within me from that peace and firmness of mind, which is of nearest kin to patience and contentment: both for that I knew I had divulged a truth linked inseparably with the most fundamental rules of Christianity, to stand or fall together, and was not un-informed that divers learned and judicious men, testified their daily approbation of the book. Yet at length it hath pleased God, who had already given me satisfaction in myself, to afford me now a means whereby I may be fully justified also in the eyes of men. When the book had been now the second time set forth well-nigh three months, as I best remember, I then first came to hear that Martin Bucer had written much concerning divorce: whom earnestly turning over, I soon perceived, but not without amazement, in the same opinion, confirmed with the same reasons which in that published book, without the help or imitation of any precedent writer, I had laboured out, and laid together. Not but that there is some difference in the handling, in the order, and the number of arguments, but still agreeing in the same conclusion. So as I may justly gratulate mine own mind with due acknowledgment of assistance from above, which led me, not as a learner, but as a collateral teacher, to a sympathy of judgment with no less a man than Martin Bucer. And he, if our things here below arrive him where he is, does not repent him to see that point of knowledge which he first, and with an unchecked freedom preached to those more knowing times of England, now found so necessary, though what he admonished were lost out of our memory; yet that God doth now again create the same doctrine in another unwritten table, and raises it up immediately out of his pure oracle to the conviction of a perverse age, eager in the reformation of names and ceremonies, but in realities as traditional and as ignorant as their forefathers. I would ask now the foremost of my profound accusers, whether they dare affirm that to be licentious, new, and dangerous, which Martin Bucer so often, and so urgently avouched to be most lawful, most necessary, and most christian, without the least blemish to his good name, among all the worthy men of that age, and since, who testify so highly of him? if they dare, they must then set up an arrogance of their own against all those churches and saints who honoured him without this exception: if they dare not, how can they now make that, licentious doctrine in another, which was never blamed or confuted in Bucer, or in Fagius? The truth is, there will be due to them for this their unadvised rashness, the best donative that can be given them; I mean, a round reproof; now that where they thought to be most magisterial, they have displayed their own want, both of reading, and of judgment. First, to be so unacquainted in the writings of Bucer, which are so obvious and so useful in their own faculty; next, to be so caught in a prejudicating weakness, as to condemn that for lewd, which (whether they knew or not) these elect servants of Christ commended for lawful; and for new, that which was taught by these almost the first and greatest authors of reformation, who were never taxed for so teaching; and dedicated without scruple to a royal pair of the first reforming kings in Christendom, and confessed in the public confession of a most Orthodoxal church and state in Germany. This

is

238 The Judgment of Martin Bucer, concerning Divorce.

is also another fault which I must tell them; that they have stood now almost this whole year clamouring afar off, while the book hath been twice printed, twice bought up, and never once vouchsafed a friendly conference with the author, who would be glad and thankful to be shewn an error, either by private dispute, or public answer, and could retract, as well as wise men before him; might also be worth the gaining, as one who heretofore hath done good service to the church by their own confession. Or if he be obstinate, their confutation would have rendered him without excuse, and reclaimed others of no mean parts, who incline to his opinion. But now their work is more than doubled; and how they will hold up their heads against the sudden aspect of these two great and reverend saints whom they have defamed, how they will make good the censuring of that, for a novelty of licence, which Bucer constantly taught to be a pure and holy law of Christ's kingdom, let them advise. For against these my adversaries, who before the examining of a propounded truth in a fit time of reformation, have had the conscience to oppose naught else but their blind reproaches and surmises, that a single innocence might not be oppressed and overborn by a crew of mouths, for the restoring of a law and doctrine falsely and unlearnedly reputed new and scandalous; God, that I may ever magnify and record this his goodness, hath unexpectedly raised up as it were from the dead, more than one famous light of the first reformation to bear witness with me, and to do me honour in that very thing, wherein these men thought to have blotted me: And hath given them the proof of a capacity which they despised, running equal, and authentic with some of their chiefest masters unthought of, and in a point of sagest moment. However, if we know at all when to ascribe the occurrences of this life to the work of a special Providence, as nothing is more usual in the talk of good men, what can be more like to a special Providence of God, than in the first reformation of England, that this question of divorce, as a main thing to be restored to just freedom, was written, and seriously commended to Edward the VIth. by a man called from another country to be the instructor of our nation; and now in this present renewing of the church and commonwealth, which we pray may be more lasting, that the same question should be again treated and presented to this parliament, by one enabled to use the same reasons without the least fight or knowledge of what was done before? It were no trespass, Lords and Commons! though something of less note were attributed to the ordering of a heavenly power; this question therefore of such prime concernment both to christian and civil welfare, in such an extraordinary manner, not recovered, but plainly twice born to these latter ages, as from a divine hand I tender to your acceptance, and most considerate thoughts. Think not that God raised up in vain a man of greatest authority in the church, to tell a trivial and licentious tale in the ears of that good prince, and to bequeath it as his last will and testament, nay rather as the testament and royal law of Christ to this nation; or that it should of itself after so many years, as it were in a new field where it was never sown, grow up again as a vicious plant in the mind of another, who had spoke honestest things to the nation; though he knew not that what his youth then reasoned without a pattern, had been heard already, and well allowed from the gravity and worth of Martin Bucer: till meeting with the envy of men ignorant in their own undertaken calling, God directed him to the forgotten writings of this faithful evangelist, to be his defence and warrant against the gross imputation of broaching licence. Ye are now in the glorious way to high virtue, and matchless deeds, trusted with a most inestimable trust, the asserting of our just liberties. Ye have a nation that expects now, and from mighty sufferings aspires to be the example of all Christendom to a perfectest reforming. Dare to be as great, as ample, and as eminent in the fair progress of your noble designs, as the full and goodly stature of truth and excellence itself; as unlimited by petty precedents and copies, as your unquestionable calling from Heaven gives ye power to be. What are all our public immunities and privileges worth, and how shall it be judged that we fight for them with minds worthy to enjoy them, if we suffer ourselves in the mean while not to understand the most important freedom that

God

God and nature hath given us in the family ; which no wise nation ever wanted, till the popery and superstition of some former ages attempted to remove and alter divine and most prudent laws for human and most imprudent canons : whereby good men in the best portion of their lives, and in that ordinance of God, which entitles them from the beginning to most just and requisite contentments, are compelled to civil indignities, which by the law of Moses bad men were not compelled to ? Be not bound about, and straitened in the spacious wisdom of your free spirits, by the scanty and unadequate and inconsistent principles of such as condemn others for adhering to traditions, and are themselves the prostrate worshippers of custom ; and of such a tradition as they can deduce from no antiquity, but from the rudest, and thickest barbarism of antichristian times. But why do I anticipate the more acceptable, and prevailing voice of learned Bucer himself, the pastor of nations ? And O that I could set him living before ye in that doctoral chair, where once the learnedest of England, thought it no disparagement to sit at his feet ! He would be such a pilot, and such a father to ye, as ye would soon find the difference of his hand and skill upon the helm of reformation. Nor do I forget that faithful associate of his labours, Paulus Fagius ; for these their great names and merits, how precious soever, God hath now joined with me necessarily, in the good or evil report of this doctrine which I leave with you. It was written to a religious king of this land, written earnestly, as a main matter wherein this kingdom needed a reform, if it purposed to be the kingdom of Christ : Written by him, who if any, since the days of Luther, merits to be counted the Apostle of our Church : whose unwearied pains and watching for our sakes, as they spent him quickly here among us, so did they, during the shortness of his life, incredibly promote the gospel throughout this realm. The authority, the learning, the godliness of this man consulted with, is able to out-balance all that the lightness of a vulgar opposition can bring to counterpoise. I leave him also as my compleat surety and testimonial, if truth be not the best witness to itself, that what I formerly presented to your reading on this subject, was good, and just, and honest, not licentious. Not that I have now more confidence by the addition of these great authors to my party ; for what I wrote was not my opinion, but my knowledge ; even then when I could trace no footstep in the way I went : nor that I think to win upon your apprehensions with numbers and with names, rather than with reasons ; yet certainly the worst of my detractors will not except against so good a bail of my integrity and judgment, as now appears for me. They must else put in the fame of Bucer and of Fagius, as my accomplices and confederates, into the same indictment ; they must dig up the good name of these prime worthies (if their names could be ever buried) they must dig them up and brand them as the papists did their bodies ; and those their pure unblameable spirits, which live not only in heaven, but in their writings, they must attaint with new attainures, which no protestant ever before aspersed them with. Or if perhaps we may obtain to get our appeachment new drawn a writ of error, not of libertinism, that those two principal leaders of reformation may not now come to be sued in a bill of licence, to the scandal of our Church ; the brief result will be, that for the error, if their own works be not thought sufficient to defend them, there lives yet, who will be ready, in a fair and christianly discussive way, to debate and sift this matter to the utmost ounce of learning and religion, in him that shall lay it as an error, either upon Martin Bucer, or any other of his opinion. If this be not enough to qualify my traducers, and that they think it more for the wisdom of their virulence, not to recant the injuries they have bespoken me, I shall not for much more disturbance than they can bring me, intermit the prosecution of those thoughts which may render me best serviceable, either to this age, or if it so happen, to posterity ; following the fair path which your illustrious exploits, honoured lords and commons ! against the breast of tyranny have opened ; and depending so on your happy successes in the hopes that I have conceived either of myself, or of the nation, as must needs conclude me one who most affectionately wishes and awaits the prosperous issue of your noble and valorous counsels.

JOHN MILTON.

The Judgment of MARTIN BUCER,

TOUCHING

D I V O R C E.

Taken out of the second book entitled, "Of the kingdom of Christ;" written by MARTIN BUCER to EDWARD the Sixth King of England.

C H A P. XV.

The seventh law of the sanctifying and ordering of marriage. That the ordering of marriage belongs to the civil power. That the Popes have invaded by fraud and force, the ordering of marriage.

BESIDES these things, Christ our king, and his churches require from your sacred majesty, that you would take upon you the just care of marriages. For it is unspeakable how many good consciences are hereby entangled, afflicted, and in danger, because there are no just laws, no speedy way constituted according to God's word, touching this holy society and fountain of mankind. For seeing matrimony is a civil thing, men, that they may rightly contract, inviolably keep, and not without extreme necessity dissolve marriage, are not only to be taught by the doctrine and discipline of the Church, but also are to be acquitted, aided, and compelled by laws and judicature of the commonwealth. Which thing pious emperors acknowledging, and therein framing themselves to the law of nations, gave laws both of contracting and preserving, and also where an unhappy need required, of divorcing marriages. As may be seen in the Code of Justinian, the 5th book, from the beginning through twenty-four titles. And in the authentic of Justinian the 22d, and some others.

But the antichrists of Rome, to get the imperial power into their own hands, first by fraudulent persuasion, afterwards by force drew to themselves the whole authority of determining and judging as well in matrimonial causes, as in most other matters. Therefore it hath been long believed, that the care and government thereof doth not belong to the civil magistrate. Yet where the gospel of Christ is received, the laws of antichrist should be rejected. If therefore kings and governors take not this care, by the power of law and justice to provide that marriages be piously contracted, religiously kept, and lawfully dissolved, if need require, who sees not what confusion and trouble is brought upon this holy society; and what a rack is prepared, even for many of the best consciences, while they have no certain laws to follow, no justice to implore, if any intolerable thing happen? And how much it concerns the honour and safety of the commonwealth, that marriages, according to the will of Christ, be made, maintained, and not without just cause dissolved, who understands not? For unless that first and holiest society of man and woman be purely constituted, that household discipline may be upheld by them according to God's law, how can we expect a race of good men? Let your majesty therefore know that this is your duty, and in the first place, to reassume to yourself the just ordering of matrimony, and
by,

The Judgment of Martin Bucer, concerning Divorce. 241

by firm laws to establish and defend the religion of this first and divine society among men, as all wise law-givers of old, and christian emperors have carefully done.

The two next chapters, because they chiefly treat about the degrees of consanguinity and affinity, I omit; only setting down a passage or two concerning the judicial laws of Moses, how fit they be for christians to imitate rather than any other.

C H A P. XVII. toward the end.

I Confess that we being free in Christ, are not bound to the civil laws of Moses in every circumstance; yet seeing no laws can be more honest, just, and wholesome, than those which God himself gave, who is eternal wisdom and goodness, I see not why christians, in things which no less appertain to them, ought not to follow the laws of God, rather than of any men. We are not to use circumcision, sacrifice, and those bodily washings prescribed to the Jews; yet by these things we may rightly learn, with what purity and devotion both Baptism and the Lord's supper should be administered and received. How much more is it our duty to observe diligently what the Lord hath commanded, and taught by the examples of his people concerning marriage, whereof we have the use no less than they?

And because this same worthy author hath another passage to this purpose, in his comment upon Matthew, Chap. v. 19. I here insert it from p. 46.

Since we have need of civil laws, and the power of punishing, it will be wisest not to condemn those given by Moses; but seriously rather to consider what the meaning of God was in them, what he chiefly required, and how much it might be to the good of every nation, if they would borrow thence their manner of governing the commonwealth; yet freely all things and with the spirit of Christ. For what Solon, or Plato, or Aristotle, what lawyers or Cæsars could make better laws than God? And it is no light argument, that many magistrates at this day, do not enough acknowledge the kingdom of Christ, though they would seem most Christian, in that they govern their states by laws so diverse from those of Moses.

The 18th chapter I only mention as determining a thing not here in question, that marriage without consent of parents ought not to be held good; yet with this qualification fit to be known.

That if parents admit not the honest desires of their children, but shall persist to abuse the power they have over them; they are to be mollified by admonitions, entreaties and persuasions, first of their friends and kindred, next of the Church-elders. Whom if still the hard parents refuse to hear, then ought the magistrate to interpose his power: lest any by the evil mind of their parents be detained from marriage longer than is meet, or forced to an unworthy match: in which case the Roman laws also provided. C. de nupt. l. 11, 13, 26.

C H A P. XIX.

Whether it may be permitted to revoke the promise of marriage.

HERE ariseth another question concerning contracts, when they ought to be unchangeable? for religious emperors decreed that the contract was not indissoluble, until the spouse were brought home, and the solemnities performed. They thought it a thing unworthy of divine and human equity, and the due consideration of man's infirmity in deliberating and determining, when space is given to renounce other contracts of much less moment, which are not yet confirmed before the magistrate, to deny that to the most weighty contract of marriage, which requires the greatest care and consultation. Yet

lest such a covenant should be broken for no just cause, and to the injury of that person to whom marriage was promised, they decreed a fine, that he who denied marriage to whom he had promised, and for some cause not approved by the judges, should pay the double of that pledge which was given at making sure, or as much as the judge should pronounce might satisfy the damage, or the hindrance of either party. It being most certain, that oft-times after contract, just and honest causes of departing from promise, come to be known and found out, it cannot be other than the duty of pious princes to give men the same liberty of unpromising in these cases, as pious emperors granted: especially where there is only a promise, and not carnal knowledge. And as there is no true marriage between them, who agree not in true consent of mind; so it will be the part of godly magistrates to procure that no matrimony be among their subjects, but what is knit with love and consent. And tho' your majesty be not bound to the imperial laws, yet it is the duty of a christian king to embrace and follow whatever he knows to be any where piously and justly constituted, and to be honest, just, and well-pleasing to his people. But why in God's law and the examples of his saints, nothing hereof is read, no marvel; seeing his ancient people had power, yea a precept, that whoso could not bend his mind to the true love of his wife, should give her a bill of divorce, and send her from him, though after carnal knowledge and long dwelling together. This is enough to authorize a godly prince in that indulgence which he gives to the changing of a contract; both because it is certainly the invention of antichrist, that the promise of marriage *de præsenti*, as they call it, should be indissoluble, and because it should be a prince's care that matrimony be so joined, as God ordained; which is, that every one should love his wife with such a love as Adam express'd to Eve: So as we may hope that they who marry may become one flesh, and one also in the Lord.

C H A P. XX.

Concerns only the celebration of marriage.

C H A P. XXI.

The means of preserving marriage holy and pure.

NOW since there ought not to be less care that marriage be religiously kept, than that it be piously and deliberately contracted, it will be meet that to every Church be ordained certain grave and godly men, who may have this care upon them, to observe whether the husband bear himself wisely toward the wife, loving, and inciting her to all piety, and the other duties of this life; and whether the wife be subject to her husband, and study to be truly a meet help to him, as first to all godliness, so to every other use of life. And if they shall find each to other failing of their duty, or the one long absent from the other without just and urgent cause, or giving suspicion of irreligious and impure life, or of living in manifest wickedness, let it be admonished them in time. And if their authority be contemned, let the names of such contemners be brought to the magistrate, who may use punishment to compel such violators of marriage to their duty, that they may abstain from all probable suspicion of transgressing; and if they admit of suspected company, the magistrate is to forbid them; whom they not therein obeying, are to be punished as adulterers, according to the law of Justinian, Authent. 117. For if holy wedlock, the fountain and seminary of good subjects, be not vigilantly preserved from all blots and disturbances, what can be hoped, as I said before, of the springing up of good men, and a right reformation of the commonwealth? We know it is not enough for Christians to abstain from foul deeds, but from the appearance and suspicion thereof.

C H A P. XXII.

Of lawful Divorce, what the ancient Churches have thought.

NOW we shall speak about that dissolving of matrimony which may be approved in the sight of God, if any grievous necessity require. In which thing the Roman antichrists have knit many a pernicious entanglement to distressed consciences: for that they might here also exalt themselves above God, as if they would be wiser and chaster than God himself is; for no cause, honest or necessary, will they permit a final divorce: in the mean while, whoredoms and adulteries, and worse things than these, not only tolerating in themselves and others, but cherishing and throwing men headlong into these evils. For although they also disjoin married persons from board and bed, that is, from all conjugal society and communion, and this not only for adultery, but for ill usage, and matrimonial duties denied; yet they forbid those thus parted, to join in wedlock with others; but, as I said before, any dishonest associating they permit. And they pronounce the bond of marriage to remain between those whom they have thus separated. As if the bond of marriage, God so teaching and pronouncing, were not such a league as binds the married couple to all society of life, and communion in divine and human things; and so associated keeps them. Something indeed out of the later fathers they may pretend for this their tyranny, especially out of Austin and some others, who were much taken with a preposterous admiration of single life; yet though these fathers, from the words of Christ not rightly understood, taught that it was unlawful to marry again, while the former wife lived, whatever cause there had been either of desertion or divorce; yet if we mark the custom of the church, and the common judgment which both in their times and afterward prevailed, we shall perceive that neither these fathers did ever cast out of the church any one for marrying after a divorce, approved by the imperial laws.

Nor only the first christian emperors, but the latter also, even to Justinian, and after him, did grant for certain causes approved by judges, to make a true divorce; which made and confirmed by law, it might be lawful to marry again: which if it could not have been done without displeasing Christ and his church, surely it would not have been granted by christian emperors, nor had the fathers then winked at those doings in the emperors. Hence ye may see that Jerom also, though zealous of single life more than enough, and such a condemner of second marriage, though after the death of either party, yet forced by plain equity, defended Fabiola, a noble matron of Rome, who having refused her husband for just causes, was married to another. For that the sending of a divorce to her husband was not blame-worthy, he affirms, because the man was heinously vicious; and that if an adulterous wife may be discarded, an adulterous husband is not to be kept. But that she married again, while yet her husband was alive; he defends in that the Apostle hath said, "It is better to marry than to burn;" and that young widows should marry, for such was Fabiola, and could not remain in widowhood.

But some one will object that Jerome there adds, "Neither did she know the vigour of the gospel, wherein all cause of marrying is debarred from women, while their husbands live; and again, while she avoided many wounds of Satan, she received one ere she was aware." But let the equal reader mind also what went before; "Because," saith he, soon after the beginning, "there is a rock and storm of slanderers opposed against her, I will not praise her converted, unless I first absolve her guilty." For why does he call them slanderers who accused Fabiola of marrying again, if he did not judge it a matter of christian equity and charity, to pass by and pardon that fact, though in his own opinion he held it a fault? And what can this mean, "I will not praise her, unless I first absolve her?" For how could he absolve her, but by proving that Fabiola, neither in rejecting

her vitious husband, nor in marrying another, had committed such a sin, as could be justly condemned? Nay, he proves both by evident reason, and clear testimonies of scripture, that she avoided sin.

This also is hence understood, that Jerome by the vigour of the gospel, meant that height and perfection of our Saviour's precept, which might be remitted to those that burn; for he adds, "But if she be accused in that she remained not unmarried, I shall confess the fault, so I may relate the necessity." If then he acknowledged a necessity, as he did, because she was young, and could not live in widowhood, certainly he could not impute her second marriage to her much blame: but when he excuses her out of the word of God, does he not openly declare his thoughts, that the second marriage of Fabiola was permitted her by the Holy Ghost himself, for the necessity which he suffered, and to shun the danger of fornication, though she went somewhat aside from the vigour of the gospel? But if any urge that Fabiola did public penance for her second marriage, which was not imposed but for great faults; it is answered, she was not enjoined to this penance, but did it of her own accord, "and not till after her second husband's death." As in the time of Cyprian, we read that many were wont to do voluntary penance for small faults, which were not liable to excommunication.

C H A P. XXIII.

That marriage was granted by the ancient fathers, even after the vow of single life.

I omit his testimonies out of Cyprian, Gelasius, Epiphanius, contented only to relate what he thence collects to the present purpose.

SOME will say perhaps, Wherefore all this concerning marriage after vow of single life, when as the question was of marriage after divorce? For this reason, that they whom it so much moves, because some of the fathers thought marriage after any kind of divorce, to be condemned of our Saviour, may see that this conclusion follows not. The fathers thought all marriage after divorce to be forbidden of our Saviour, therefore they thought such marriage was not to be tolerated in a Christian. For the same fathers judged it forbidden to marry after vow; yet such marriages they neither dissolved nor excommunicated: for these words of our Saviour, and of the Holy Ghost, stood in their way; "All cannot receive this saying, but they to whom it is given. Every one hath his proper gift from God, one after this manner, another after that. It is better to marry than to burn. I will that younger widows marry;" and the like.

So there are many canons and laws extant, whereby priests, if they married, were removed from their office, yet is it not read that their marriage was dissolved, as the papists now-a-days do, or that they were excommunicated, nay expressly they might communicate as laymen. If the consideration of human infirmity, and those testimonies of divine scripture which grant marriage to every one that wants it, persuaded those fathers to bear themselves so humanely toward them who had married with breach of vow to God, as they believed, and with divorce of that marriage wherein they were in a manner joined to God; who doubts but that the same fathers held the like humanity was to be afforded to those who after divorce and faith broken with men, as they thought, entered into a second marriage? For among such are also found no less weak, and no less burning.

C H A P. XXIV.

Who of the ancient fathers have granted marriage after divorce.

THIS is clear both by what hath been said, and by that which Origen relates of certain bishops in his time, Homil. 7. in Matth. "I know some," saith he, "which are over churches, who without scripture have permitted the wife to marry while her former husband lived. And did this against scripture, which saith, the wife is bound to her husband so long as he lives; and she shall be called an adulteress, if, her husband living, she take another man; yet did they not permit this without cause, perhaps for the infirmity of such as had not continence, they permitted evil to avoid worse." Ye see Origen and the doctors of his age, not without all cause, permitted women after divorce to marry, though their former husbands were living; yet writes that they permitted against scripture. But what cause could they have to do so, unless they thought our Saviour in his precepts of divorce had so forbidden, as willing to remit such perfection to his weaker ones, cast into danger of worse faults?

The same thought Leo, Bishop of Rome, Ep. 85. to the African Bishops of Mauritania Cæsariensis, wherein complaining of a certain priest, who divorcing his wife, or being divorced by her, as other copies have it, had married another, neither dissolves the matrimony, nor excommunicates him, only unpriests him. The fathers therefore, as we see, did not simply and wholly condemn marriage after divorce.

But as for me, this remitting of our Saviour's precepts, which these ancients allow to the infirm in marrying after vow and divorce, I can in no ways admit; for whatsoever plainly consents not with the commandment, cannot, I am certain, be permitted, or suffered in any Christian: for Heaven and earth shall pass away, but not a tittle from the commands of God among them who expect life eternal. Let us therefore consider, and weigh the words of our Lord concerning marriage and divorce, which he pronounced both by himself, and by his apostle, and let us compare them with other oracles of God; for whatsoever is contrary to these, I shall not persuade the least tolerating thereof. But if it can be taught to agree with the word of God, yea to be commanded that most men may have permission given them to divorce and marry again, I must prefer the authority of God's word before the opinion of fathers and doctors, as they themselves teach.

C H A P. XXV.

The words of our Lord, and of the Holy Ghost, by the Apostle Paul concerning Divorce, are explained. The 1st axiom that Christ could not condemn of Adultery, that which he once commanded.

BUT the words of our Lord, and of the Holy Ghost, out of which Austin and some others of the fathers think it concluded that our Saviour forbids marriage after any divorce, are these; Mat. v. 31, 32. "It hath been said, &c. And Matt. xix. 7. They say unto him, why did Moses then command," &c. And Mark x. and Luke xvi. Rom. vii. 1, 2, 3. 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11. Hence therefore they conclude that all marriage after divorce is called adultery; which to commit, being no ways to be tolerated in any christian, they think it follows that second marriage is in no case to be permitted either to the divorce, or to the divorced.

But that it may be more fully and plainly perceived what force is in this kind of reasoning, it will be the best course to lay down certain grounds whereof no Christian can doubt the truth. First, it is a wickedness to suspect that our Saviour branded that

246 The Judgment of Martin Bucer, concerning Divorce.

that for adultery, which himself, in his own law which he came to fulfil, and not to dissolve, did not only permit, but also command; for by him the only mediator, was the whole law of God given. But that by this law of God, marriage was permitted after any divorce, is certain by Deut. xxiv. 1.

C H A P. XXVI.

That God in his law did not only grant, but also command divorce to certain men.

DEUT. xxiv. 1. "When a man hath taken a wife," &c. But in Mal. ii. 15, 16. is read the Lord's command to put her away whom a man hates, in these words: "Take heed to your spirit, and let none deal injuriously against the wife of his youth. If he hate, let him put away, saith the Lord God of Israel. And he shall hide thy violence with his garment," that marries her divorced by thee, "saith the Lord of Hosts; but take heed to your spirit, and do no injury." By these testimonies of the divine law, we see that the Lord did not only permit, but also expressly and earnestly commanded his people, by whom he would that all holiness and faith of marriage-covenant should be observed, that he who could not induce his mind to love his wife with a true conjugal love, might dismiss her that she might marry to another.

C H A P. XXVII.

That what the Lord permitted and commanded to his ancient people concerning Divorce belongs also to Christians.

NOW what the Lord permitted to his first born people, that certainly he could not forbid to his own among the Gentiles, whom he made coheirs, and into one body with his people; nor could he ever permit, much less command aught that was not good for them, at least so used as he commanded. For being God, he is not changed as man. Which thing who seriously considers, how can he imagine that God would make that wicked to them that believe, and serve him under grace, which he granted and commanded to them that served him under the law? Whenas the same causes require the same permission. And who that knows but human matters, and loves the truth, will deny that many marriages hang as ill together now, as ever they did among the Jews? So that such marriages are liker to torments than true marriages. As therefore the Lord doth always succour and help the oppressed, so he would ever have it provided for injured husbands and wives, that under pretence of the marriage bond, they be not sold to perpetual vexations, instead of the loving and comfortable marriage-duties. And lastly, as God doth always detest hypocrisy and fraud, so neither doth he approve that among his people, that should be counted marriage, wherein none of those duties remain, whereby the league of wedlock is chiefly preserved. What inconsiderate neglect then of God's law is this, that I may not call it worse, to hold that Christ our Lord would not grant the same remedies both of divorce and second marriage to the weak, or to the evil, if they will needs have it so, but especially to the innocent and wronged; whenas the same urgent causes remain as before, when the discipline of the Church and Magistrate hath tried what may be tried?

C H A P. XXVIII.

That our Lord Christ intended not to make new laws of marriage and divorce, or of any civil matters. Axiom 2.

IT is agreed by all who determine of the kingdom and offices of Christ by the holy scriptures, as all godly men ought to do, that our Saviour upon earth took not on him either to give new laws in civil affairs, or to change the old. But it is certain that matrimony and divorce are civil things. Which the christian emperors knowing, gave conjugal laws, and reserved the administration of them to their own courts; which no true ancient bishop ever condemned.

Our Saviour came to preach repentance and remission: seeing therefore those who put away their wives without any just cause, were not touched with conscience of the sin, through misunderstanding of the law, he recalled them to a right interpretation, and taught that the woman in the beginning was so joined to the man, that there should be a perpetual union both in body and spirit: where this is not, the matrimony is already broke, before there be yet any divorce made, or second marriage.

C H A P. XXIX.

That it is wicked to strain the words of Christ beyond their purpose.

This is his third Axiom, whereof there needs no explication here.

C H A P. XXX.

That all places of Scripture about the same thing are to be joined, and compared, to avoid contradictions. Axiom 4.

This he demonstrates at large out of sundry places in the gospel, and principally by that * precept against swearing, which compared with many places of the law and prophets, is a flat contradiction of them all, if we follow superstitiously the letter. Then having repeated briefly his four axioms, he thus proceeds.

These things thus pre-admonished, let us enquire what the undoubted meaning is of our Saviour's words, and enquire according to the rule which is observed by all learned and good men in their expositions; that praying first to God, who is the only opener of our hearts, we may first with fear and reverence consider well the words of our Saviour touching this question. Next, that we may compare them with all other places of scripture treating of this matter, to see how they consent with our Saviour's words, and those of his apostle.

C H A P. XXXI.

This Chapter disputes against Austin and the Papists, who deny second marriage even to them who divorce in case of adultery; which because it is not controverted among true protestants, but that the innocent person is easily allowed to marry, I spare the translating.

* Matthew v. 34

C H A P. XXXII.

That a manifest Adultress ought to be divorced, and cannot lawfully be retained in marriage by any true christian.

This though he prove sufficiently, yet I let pass, because this question was not handled in the doctrine and discipline of divorce; to which book I bring so much of this treatise as runs parallel.

C H A P. XXXIII.

That Adultery is to be punished with Death.

This Chapter also I omit for the reason last alledged.

C H A P. XXXIV.

That it is lawful for a wife to leave an Adulterer, and to marry another husband.

This is generally granted, and therefore excuses me the writing out.

C H A P. XXXV.

Places in the writings of the apostle Paul, touching divorce explained.

LET us consider the answers of the Lord given by the apostle severally. Concerning the first, which is Rom. vii. 1. "Know ye not, brethren, for I speak to them that know the law, &c. Ver. 2. The woman is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth." Here it is certain that the Holy Ghost had no purpose to determine aught of marriage, or divorce, but only to bring an example from the common and ordinary law of wedlock, to shew that as no covenant holds either party being dead, so now that we are not bound to the law, but to Christ our Lord, seeing that through him we are dead to sin, and to the law; and so joined to Christ that we may bring forth fruit in him from a willing godliness, and not by the compulsion of law, whereby our sins are more excited, and become more violent. What therefore the holy spirit here speaks of matrimony, cannot be extended beyond the general rule.

Besides it is manifest, that the apostle did alledge the law of wedlock, as it was delivered to the Jews; for, saith he, I speak to them that know the law. They knew no law of God but that by Moses, which plainly grants divorce for several reasons. It cannot therefore be said that the apostle cited this general example out of the law, to abolish the several exceptions of that law, which God himself granted by giving authority to divorce.

Next, when the apostle brings an example out of God's law concerning man and wife, it must be necessary that we understand such for man and wife, as are so indeed according to the same law of God; that is, who are so disposed as that they are both willing and able to perform the necessary duties of marriage; not those who under a false title of marriage, keep themselves mutually bound to injuries and disgraces; for such twain are nothing less than lawful man and wife.

The like answer is to be given to all the other places both of the gospel and the apostle, that whatever exception may be proved out of God's law, be not excluded from those places. For the spirit of God doth not condemn things formerly granted and allowed,

lowed, where there is like cause and reason. Hence Ambrose, upon that place, 1 Cor. vii. 15. "A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases, thus expounds; The reverence of marriage is not due to him who abhors the author of marriage; nor is that marriage ratified which is without devotion to God: he sins not therefore who is put away for God's cause, though he join himself to another. For the dishonour of the Creator dissolves the right of matrimony to him who is deserted, that he be not accused, though marrying to another. The faith of wedlock is not to be kept with him who departs, that he might not hear the God of Christians to be the author of wedlock. For if Ezra caused the misbelieving wives and husbands to be divorced, that God might be appeased, and not offended, though they took others of their own faith, how much more shall it be free, if the misbeliever depart, to marry one of our own religion. For this is not to be counted matrimony, which is against the law of God."

Two things are here to be observed toward the following discourse, which truth itself, and the force of God's word hath drawn from this holy man. For those words are very large, "Matrimony is not ratified, without devotion to God." And the dishonour of the Creator dissolves the right of matrimony." For devotion is far off, and dishonour is done to God by all who persist in any wickedness and heinous crime.

C H A P. XXXVI.

That although it seem in the Gospel, as if our Saviour granted Divorce only for Adultery, yet in very deed he granted it for other causes also.

NOW is to be dealt with this question, whether it be lawful to divorce and marry again for other causes besides adultery, since our Saviour expressed that only? To this question, if we retain our principles already laid, and must acknowledge it to be a cursed blasphemy, if we say that the words of God do contradict one another, of necessity we must confess that our Lord did grant divorce, and marriage after that, for other causes besides adultery, notwithstanding what he said in Matthew. For first, they who consider but only that place, 1 Cor. vii. which treats of believers and misbelievers matched together, must of force confess, That our Lord granted just divorce, and second marriage in the cause of desertion, which is other than the cause of fornication. And if there be one other cause found lawful, then is it most true, that divorce was granted not only for fornication.

Next, it cannot be doubted, as I shewed before, by them to whom it is given to know God and his judgments out of his own word, but that, what means of peace and safety God ever granted and ordained to his elected people, the same he grants and ordains to men of all ages who have equally need of the same remedies. And who, that is but a knowing man, dares say there be not husbands and wives now to be found in such a hardness of heart, that they will not perform either conjugal affection, or any requisite duty thereof, though it be most deserved at their hands?

Neither can any one defer to confess, but that God whose property it is to judge the cause of them that suffer injury, hath provided for innocent and honest persons wedded, how they might free themselves by lawful means of divorce, from the bondage and iniquity of those who are falsely termed their husbands or their wives. This is clear out of Deut. xxiv. 1. Malach. ii. Matth. xix. 1 Cor. vii. and out of those principles which the scripture every where teaches, that God changes not his mind, dissents not from himself, is no acceptor of persons; but allows the same remedies to all men oppressed with the same necessities and infirmities; yea, requires that we should use them. This he will easily perceive, who considers these things in the spirit of the Lord.

Lastly, it is most certain, that the Lord hath commanded us to obey the civil laws every one of his own commonwealth, if they be not against the laws of God.

C H A P. XXXVII.

For what causes Divorce is permitted by the civil law ex l. Consensu Codic. de Repudiis.

IT is also manifest that the law of Theodosius and Valentinian, which begins "Consensu," &c. touching divorce, and many other decrees of pious emperors agreeing herewith, are not contrary to the word of God; and therefore may be recalled into use by any christian prince or commonwealth; nay, ought to be with due respect had to every nation: For whatsoever is equal and just, that in every thing is to be sought and used by christians. Hence it is plain that divorce is granted by divine approbation, both to husbands and to wives, if either party can convict the other of these following offences before the magistrate.

If the husband can prove the wife to be an adulteress, a witch, a murderess; to have bought or sold to slavery any one free-born, to have violated sepulchres, committed sacrilege, favoured thieves and robbers, desirous of feasting with strangers, the husband not knowing, or not willing, if she lodge forth without a just and probable cause, or frequent theatres and fights, he forbidding; if she be privy with those that plot against the state, or if she deal falsely, or offer blows. And if the wife can prove her husband guilty of any those forenamed crimes, and frequent the company of lewd women in her sight; or if he beat her, she had the like liberty to quit herself; with this difference, that the man after divorce might forthwith marry again; the woman not till a year after, lest she might chance to have conceived.

C H A P. XXXVIII.

An exposition of those places wherein God declares the nature of holy wedlock.

NOW to the end it may be seen that this agrees with the divine law, the first institution of marriage is to be considered, and those texts in which God established the joining of male and female, and described the duties of them both. When God had determined to make woman, and give her as a wife to man, he spake thus, Gen. ii. 18. "It is not good for man to be alone, I will make him a help-meet for him. And Adam said," but in the spirit of God, v. 23, 24. "This is now bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh: Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be one flesh."

To this first institution did Christ recall his own; when answering the Pharisees, he condemned the licence of unlawful divorce. He taught therefore by his example, that we, according to this first institution, and what God hath spoken thereof, ought to determine what kind of covenant marriage is, how to be kept, and how far; and lastly, for what causes to be dissolved. To which decrees of God these also are to be joined, which the Holy Ghost hath taught by his apostle, that neither the husband nor the wife "hath power of their own body, but mutually each of either's." That "the husband shall love the wife as his own body, yea as Christ loves his church; and that the wife ought to be subject to her husband, as the church is to Christ."

By these things the nature of holy wedlock is certainly known; whereof if only one be wanting in both or either party, and that either by obstinate malevolence, or too deep inbred weakness of mind, or lastly, through incurable impotence of Body, it cannot then be said that the covenant of matrimony holds good between such; if we mean that covenant which God instituted and called marriage, and that whereof only

it must be understood that our Saviour said, "Those whom God hath joined, let no man separate."

And hence is concluded, that matrimony requires continual cohabitation and living together, unless the calling of God be otherwise evident; which union if the parties themselves disjoin either by mutual consent, or one against the other's will depart, the marriage is then broken. Wherein the Papists, as in other things, oppose themselves against God; while they separate for many causes from bed and board, and yet will have the bond of matrimony remain, as if this covenant could be other than the conjunction and communion not only of bed and board, but of all other loving and helpful duties. This we may see in these words; "I will make him a help-meet for him; bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh: for this cause shall he leave father and mother, and cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh." By which words who discerns not, that God requires of them both so to live together, and to be united not only in body but in mind also, with such an affection as none may be dearer and more ardent among all the relations of mankind, nor of more efficacy to the mutual offices of love and loyalty. They must communicate and consent in all things both divine and human, which have any moment to well and happy living. The wife must honour and obey her husband, as the church honours and obeys Christ her head. The husband must love and cherish his wife, as Christ his church. Thus they must be to each other, if they will be true man and wife in the sight of God, whom certainly the churches ought to follow in their judgment. Now the proper and ultimate end of marriage is not copulation, or children, for then there was not true matrimony between Joseph and Mary the mother of Christ, nor between many holy persons more; but the full and proper and main end of marriage, is the communicating of all duties, both divine and human, each to other with utmost benevolence and affection.

C H A P. XXXIX.

The Properties of a true and christian marriage, more distinctly repeated.

BY which definition we may know that God esteems and reckons upon these four necessary properties to be in every true marriage. 1. That they should live together, unless the calling of God require otherwise for a time. 2. That they should love one another to the height of dearness, and that in the Lord, and in the communion of true religion. 3. That the husband bear himself as the head and preserver of his wife, instructing her to all godliness and integrity of life; that the wife also be to her husband a help, according to her place, especially furthering him in the true worship of God, and next in all the occasions of civil life. And 4. That they defraud not each other of conjugal benevolence, as the apostle commands, 1 Cor. vii. Hence it follows, according to the sentence of God, which all Christians ought to be ruled by, that between those who either through obstinacy, or helpless inability, cannot or will not perform these repeated duties, between those there can be no true matrimony, nor ought they to be counted man and wife.

C H A P. XL.

Whether those crimes recited chap. xxxvii. out of the civil law, dissolve matrimony in God's account.

NOW if a husband or wife be found guilty of any of those crimes, which by the law "consensu" are made causes of divorce, it is manifest that such a man cannot be the head and preserver of his wife, nor such a woman be a meet help to her husband, as the divine law in true wedlock requires; for these faults are punished either by death, or deportation, or extreme infamy, which are directly opposite to the covenant of marriage. If they deserve death, as adultery and the like, doubtless God would not that any should live in wedlock with them whom he would not have to live at all. Or if it be not death, but the incurring of notorious infamy, certain it is neither just, nor expedient, nor meet, that an honest man should be coupled with an infamous woman, nor an honest matron with an infamous man. The wise Roman princes had so great regard to the equal honour of either wedded person, that they counted those marriages of no force which were made between the one of good repute, and the other of evil note. How much more will all honest regard of christian expedience and comeliness beseech and concern those who are set free and dignified in Christ, than it could the Roman senate, or their sons, for whom that law was provided?

And this all godly men will soon apprehend, that he who ought to be the head and preserver not only of his wife, but also of his children and family, as Christ is of his Church, had need be one of honest name: so likewise the wife, which is to be the meet help of an honest and good man, the mother of an honest offspring and family, the glory of the man, even as the man is the glory of Christ, should not be tainted with ignominy; as neither of them can avoid to be, having been justly appeached of those forenamed crimes; and therefore cannot be worthy to hold their place in a christian family: yea, they themselves turn out themselves and dissolve that holy covenant. And they who are true brethren and sisters in the lord, are no more in bondage to such violaters of marriage.

But here the patrons of wickedness and dissolvers of christian discipline will object, that it is the part of man and wife to bear one another's cross, whether in calamity or infamy, that they might gain each other, if not to a good name, yet to repentance and amendment. But they who thus object, seek the impunity of wickedness, and the favour of wicked men, not the duties of true charity; which prefers public honesty before private interest, and had rather the remedies of wholesome punishment appointed by God should be in use, than that by remissness, the licence of evil doing should encrease. For if they who, by committing such offences, have made void the holy knot of marriage, be capable of repentance, they will be sooner moved when due punishment is executed on them, than when it is remitted.

We must ever beware, lest, in contriving what will be best for the soul's health of delinquents, we make ourselves wiser and discreeter than God. He that religiously weighs his oracles concerning marriage, cannot doubt that they who have committed the fore-said transgressions, have lost the right of matrimony, and are unworthy to hold their dignity in an honest and christian family.

But if any husband or wife see such signs of repentance in their transgressor, as that they doubt not to regain them by continuing with them, and partaking of their miseries and attainures, they may be left to their own hopes, and their own mind; saving ever the right of Church and commonwealth, that it receive no scandal by the neglect of due severity,

severity, and their children no harm by this invitation to licence, and want of good education.

From all these considerations, if they be thought on, as in the presence of God, and out of his word, any one may perceive, who desires to determine of these things by the scripture, that those causes of lawful divorce, which the most religious emperors Theodosius and Valentinian set forth in the forecited place, are according to the law of God, and the prime institution of marriage; and were still more and more straitened, as the Church and state of the empire still more and more corrupted and degenerated. Therefore pious princes and commonwealths both may and ought establish them again, if they have a mind to restore the honour, sanctity, and religion of holy wedlock to their people, and disentangle many consciences from a miserable and perilous condition, to a chaste and honest life.

To those recited causes wherefore a wife might send a divorce to her husband, Justinian added four more, *Constit. 117*. And four more, for which a man might put away his wife. Three other causes were added in the Code "*de repudiis, l. Jubemus*." All which causes are so clearly contrary to the first intent of marriage, that they plainly dissolve it. I set them not down, being easy to be found in the body of the civil law.

It was permitted also by christian emperors, that they who would divorce by mutual consent, might without impediment. Or if there were any difficulty at all in it, the law expresses the reason, that it was only in favour of the children; so that if there were none, the law of those godly emperors made no other difficulty of a divorce by consent. Or if any were minded without consent of the other to divorce, and without those causes which have been named, the Christian emperors laid no other punishment upon them, than that the husband wrongfully divorcing his wife, should give back her dowry, and the use of that which was called "*Donatio propter nuptias*;" or if there were no dowry nor no donation, that he should then give her the fourth part of his goods. The like penalty was inflicted on the wife departing without just cause. But that they who were once married, should be compelled to remain so ever against their wills, was not exacted. Wherein those pious princes followed the law of God in *Deut. xxiv. 1.* and his express charge by the prophet Malachi to dismiss from him the wife whom he hates. For God never meant in marriage to give to man a perpetual torment instead of a meet-help. Neither can God approve, that to the violation of this holy league (which is violated as soon as true affection ceases and is lost) should be added murder, which is already committed by either of them who resolvedly hates the other, as I shewed out of *1 John xv.* "Whoso hateth his brother, is a murderer."

C H A P. XLI.

Whether the husband or wife deserted, may marry to another.

THE wife's desertion of her husband, the christian emperors plainly decreed to be a just cause of divorce, whenas they granted him the right thereof, if she had but lain out one night against his will without probable cause. But of the man deserting his wife, they did not so determine: Yet if we look into the word of God, we shall find, that he who though but for a year without just cause forsakes his wife, and neither provides for her maintenance, nor signifies his purpose of returning, and good-will towards her, whenas he may, hath forfeited his right in her so forsaken. For the spirit of God speaks plainly, that both man and wife have such power over one another's person, as that they cannot deprive each other of living together, but by consent, and for a time.

Hither may be added, that the holy spirit grants desertion to be a cause of divorce, in those answers given to the Corinthians concerning a brother or sister deserted by a misbeliever. "If he depart, let him depart, a brother or a sister is not under bondage in

254 The Judgment of Martin Bucer, concerning Divorce.

in such cases." In which words, who sees not that the Holy Ghost openly pronounced, that the party without cause deserted, is not bound for another's wilful desertion, to abstain from marriage, if he have need thereof?

But some will say, that this is spoken of a misbeliever departing. But I beseech ye, doth not he reject the faith of Christ in his deeds, who rashly breaks the holy covenant of wedlock instituted by God? And besides this, the holy spirit does not make the misbelieving of him who departs, but the departing of him who misbelieves, to be the just cause of freedom to the brother or sister.

Since therefore it will be agreed among Christians, that they who depart from wedlock without just cause, do not only deny the faith of matrimony, but of Christ also, whatever they profess with their mouths; it is but reason to conclude, that the party deserted is not bound in case of causeless desertion, but that he may lawfully seek another consort, if it be needful to him, toward a pure and blameless conversation.

C H A P. XLII.

That impotence of body, leprosy, madness, &c. are just causes of divorce.

OF this, because it was not disputed in the doctrine and discipline of divorce, him that would know further, I commend to the Latin original.

C H A P. XLIII.

That to grant divorce for all the causes which have been hitherto brought, disagrees not from the words of Christ, naming only the cause of adultery.

NOW we must see how these things can stand with the words of our Saviour, who seems directly to forbid all divorce except it be for adultery. To the understanding whereof, we must ever remember this: That in the words of our Saviour there can be no contrariety: That his words and answers are not to be stretched beyond the question proposed: That our Saviour did not there purpose to treat of all the causes for which it might be lawful to divorce and marry again; for then that in the Corinthians of marrying again, without guilt of adultery could not be added. That it is not good for that man to be alone, who hath not the special gift from above. That it is good for every such one to be married, that he may shun fornication.

With regard to these principles, let us see what our Lord answered to the tempting Pharisees about divorce, and second marriage, and how far his answer doth extend.

First, no man who is not very contentious, will deny that the Pharisees asked our Lord whether it were lawful to put away such a wife, as was truly, and according to God's law, to be counted a wife; that is, such a one as would dwell with her husband, and both would and could perform the necessary duties of wedlock tolerably. But she who will not dwell with her husband, is not put away by him, but goes of herself: and she who denies to be a meet-help, or to be so hath made herself unfit by open misdemeanors, or through incurable impotencies cannot be able, is not by the law of God to be esteemed a wife; as hath been shewn both from the first institution, and other places of Scripture. Neither certainly would the Pharisees propound a question concerning such an unconjugal wife; for their depravation of the law had brought them to that pass, as to think a man had right to put away his wife for any cause, though never so slight. Since therefore it is manifest that Christ answered the Pharisees concerning a fit and meet wife according to the law of God, whom he forbid to divorce for any cause but fornication; who sees not that it is a wickedness so to wrest and extend that answer of his, as if it forbade to divorce her

her who hath already forsaken, or hath lost the place and dignity of a wife, by deserved infamy, or hath undertaken to be that which she hath not natural ability to be?

This truth is so powerful, that it hath moved the Papists to grant their kind of divorce for other causes besides adultery, as for ill usage, and the not performing of conjugal duty; and to separate from bed and board for these causes, which is as much divorce as they grant for adultery.

But some perhaps will object, that though it be yielded that our Lord granted divorce not only for adultery, yet it is not certain that he permitted marriage after divorce, unless for that only cause. I answer, first, that the sentence of divorce, and second marriage, is one and the same. So that when the right of divorce is evinced to belong not only to the cause of fornication, the power of second marriage is also proved to be not limited to that cause only; and that most evidently, whenas the Holy Ghost, 1 Cor. vii. so frees the deserted party from bondage, as that he may not only send a just divorce in case of desertion, but may seek another marriage.

Lastly, seeing God will not that any should live in danger of fornication and utter ruin for the default of another, and hath commanded the husband to send away with a bill of divorce her whom he could not love; it is impossible that the charge of adultery should belong to him who for lawful causes divorces and marries, or to her who marries after she hath been unjustly rejected, or to him who receives her without all fraud to the former wedlock. For this were a horrid blasphemy against God, so to interpret his words, as to make him dissent from himself; for who sees not a flat contradiction in this, to enthrall blameless men and women to miseries and injuries, under a false and soothing title of marriage, and yet to declare by his Apostle, that a brother or sister is not under bondage in such cases? No less do these two things conflict with themselves, to enforce the innocent and faultless to endure the pain and misery of another's perverseness, or else to live in unavoidable temptation; and to affirm elsewhere that he lays on no man the burden of another man's sin, nor doth constrain any man to the endangering of his soul.

CHAP. XLIV.

That to those also who are justly divorced, second marriage ought to be permitted.

THIS although it be well proved, yet because it concerns only the offender, I leave him to search out his own charter himself in the author.

CHAP. XLV.

That some persons are so ordained to marriage, as that they cannot obtain the gift of continence, no not by earnest prayer; and that therein every one is to be left to his own judgment and conscience, and not to have a burden laid upon him by any other.

CHAP. XLVI.

The words of the Apostle concerning the praise of single life unfolded.

THESE two chapters not so immediately debating the right of divorce, I choose rather not to insert.

C H A P. XLVII.

The conclusion of this treatise.

THESE things, most renowned king, I have brought together, both to explain for what causes the unhappy, but sometimes most necessary help of divorce ought to be granted, according to God's word, by princes and rulers: as also to explain how the words of Christ do consent with such a grant. I have been large indeed both in handling those oracles of God, and in laying down those certain principles, which he who will know what the mind of God is in this matter, must ever think on and remember. But if we consider what mist and obscurity hath been poured out by antichrist upon this question, and how deep this pernicious contempt of wedlock, and admiration of single life, even in those who are not called thereto, hath sunk into many men's persuasions; I fear lest all that hath been said, be hardly enough to persuade such that they would cease at length to make themselves wiser and holier than God himself, in being so severe to grant lawful marriage, and so easy to connive at all, not only whoredoms but deflowerings and adulteries: Whenas, among the people of God, no whoredom was to be tolerated.

Our Lord Jesus Christ, who came to destroy the works of Satan, send down his spirit upon all christians, and principally upon christian governors both in Church and commonwealth (for of the clear judgment of your royal majesty I nothing doubt, revolving the scripture so often as ye do) that they may acknowledge how much they provoke the anger of God against us, whenas all kind of unchastity is tolerated, fornications and adulteries winked at; but holy and honourable wedlock is oft withheld by the mere persuasion of antichrist, from such as without this remedy, cannot preserve themselves from damnation! For none who hath but a spark of honesty will deny that princes and states ought to use diligence toward the maintaining of pure and honest life among all men, without which all justice, all fear of God, and true religion decays.

And who knows not, that chastity and pureness of life can never be restored, or continued in the commonwealth, unless it be first established in private houses, from whence the whole breed of men is to come forth? To effect this, no wise man can doubt that it is necessary for princes and magistrates first with severity to punish whoredom and adultery; next to see that marriages be lawfully contracted, and in the Lord; then that they be faithfully kept; and lastly, when that unhappiness urges, that they be lawfully dissolved, and other marriage granted, according as the law of God, and of nature, and the constitutions of pious princes have decreed; as I have shewn both by evident authorities of Scripture, together with the writings of the ancient fathers, and other testimonies. Only the Lord grant that we may learn to prefer his ever just and saving word, before the comments of antichrist, too deeply rooted in many, and the false and blasphemous exposition of our Saviour's words. Amen.

A P O S T S C R I P T.

THUS far Martin Bucer: Whom, where I might without injury to either part of the cause, I deny not to have epitomized; in the rest observing a well-warranted rule, not to give an inventory of so many words, but to weigh their force. I could have added that eloquent and right christian discourse, written by Erasmus on this argument, not disagreeing in effect from Bucer. But this, I hope, will be enough to excuse me with the mere Englishman, to be no forger, of new and loose opinions. Others may read him in his own phrase on the first to the Corinthians, and ease me who never could delight in long citations, much less in whole translations; whether it be natural disposition or education in me, or that my mother bore me a speaker of what God made mine own, and not

a translator. There be others also whom I could reckon up, of no mean account in the church (and Peter Martyr among the first) who are more than half our own in this controversy. But this is a providence not to be slighted, that as Bucer wrote this tractate of divorce in England and for England, so Erasmus professes he begun here among us the same subject, especially out of compassion, for the need he saw this nation had of some charitable redress herein; and seriously exhorts others to use their best industry in the clearing of this point, wherein custom hath a greater sway than verity. That therefore which came into the mind of these two admired strangers to do for England, and in a touch of highest prudence which they took to be not yet recovered from monastic superstition, if I a native am found to have done for mine own country, altogether suitably and conformly to their so large and clear understanding, yet without the least help of theirs; I suppose that henceforward among conscionable and judicious persons, it will no more be thought to my discredit, or at all to this nation's dishonour. And if these their books, the one shall be printed often with best allowance in most religious cities, the other with express authority of Leo the Tenth, a pope, shall, for the propagating of truth, be published and republished, though against the received opinion of that church, and mine containing but the same thing, shall in a time of reformation, a time of free speaking, free writing, not find a permission to the press; I refer me to wisest men, whether truth be suffered to be truth, or liberty to be liberty now among us, and be not again in danger of new fetters and captivity after all our hopes and labours lost: and whether learning be not (which our enemies too prophetically feared) in the way to be trodden down again by ignorance. Whereof while time is, out of the faith owing to God and my country, I bid this kingdom beware; and doubt not but God who hath dignified this parliament already to so many glorious degrees, will also give them (which is a singular blessing) to inform themselves rightly in the midst of an unprincipled age; and to prevent this working mystery of ignorance and ecclesiastical thralldom, which under new shapes and disguises begins afresh to grow upon us.

TETRACHORDON: EXPOSITIONS

UPON

The four chief places in scripture which treat of marriage, or nullities in marriage.

On { GEN. I, 27, 28. compared and explained by Gen. ii. 18, 23, 24.
DEUT. XXIV. 1, 2.
MATTH. V. 31, 32. with Matth. xix. from ver. 3, to 11.
1 COR. VII. from ver. 10, to 16.

Wherein the doctrine and discipline of Divorce, as was lately published, is confirmed by explanation of scripture, by testimony of ancient fathers, of civil laws in the primitive church, of famous reformed divines; and lastly, by an intended act of the parliament and church of England in the last year of Edward the Sixth.

—Σκαιοῖσι καινὰ προσφέρων σοφὰ
Δόξεις ἀχρεῖον, καὶ σοφὸς πεφυκέναι·
Τῶν δ' αὖ δοκόντων εἶδέναι τι ποικίλον,
Κρείσσων νομισθεὶς ἐν πόλει, λυπρὸς φανῆ.

Euripid. Medea.

To the PARLIAMENT.

THAT which I knew to be the part of a good magistrate, aiming at true liberty through the right information of religious and civil life, and that which I saw, and was partaker of, your vows and solemn covenants, parliament of England! your actions also manifestly tending to exalt the truth, and to depress the tyranny of error and ill custom, with more constancy and prowess than ever yet any, since that parliament which put the first sceptre of this kingdom into his hand whom God and extraordinary virtue made their monarch; were the causes that moved me, one else not placing much in the eminence of a dedication, to present your high notice with a discourse, conscious to itself of nothing more than of diligence, and firm affection to the public good. And that ye took it so as wise and impartial men, obtaining so great power and dignity, are wont to accept, in matters both doubtful and important, what they think offered them well meant, and from a rational ability, I had no less than to persuade me. And on that persuasion am returned, as to a famous and free port, myself also bound by more than a maritime law, to expose as freely what fraughtage I conceive to bring of no trifles. For although it be generally known, how and by whom ye have been instigated to a hard censure of that former book, entitled, "The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce," an opinion held by some of the best among reformed writers without scandal or confutement, tho' now thought new and dangerous by some of our severe Gnostics, whose little reading, and less meditat-

ing, holds ever with hardest obstinacy that which it took up with easiest credulity; I do not find yet that aught, for the furious incitements which have been used, hath issued by your appointment, that might give the least interruption or disrepute either to the author, or to the book. Which he who will be better advised than to call your neglect, or connivance at a thing imagined so perilous, can attribute it to nothing more justly, than to the deep and quiet stream of your direct and calm deliberations, that gave not way either to the fervent rashness, or the immaterial gravity of those who ceased not to exasperate without cause. For which uprightness and incorrupt refusal of what ye were incensed to, lords and commons! (though it were done to justice, not to me, and was a peculiar demonstration how far your ways are different from the rash vulgar) besides those allegiances of oath and duty, which are my public debt to your public labours, I have yet a store of gratitude laid up, which cannot be exhausted; and such thanks perhaps they may live to be, as shall more than whisper to the next ages. Yet that the author may be known to ground himself upon his own innocence, and the merit of his cause, not upon the favour of a diversion, or a delay to any just censure, but wishes rather he might see those his detractors at any fair meeting, as learned debates are privileged with a due freedom under equal moderators; I shall here briefly single one of them (because he hath obliged me to it) who I perswade me having scarce read the book, nor knowing him who writ it, or at least feigning the latter, hath not forbore to scandalize him, unconferred with, unadmonished, undealt with by any pastorly or brotherly convincement, in the most open and invective manner, and at the most bitter opportunity that drift or set design could have invented. And this, whenas the canon law, though commonly most favouring the boldness of their priests, punishes the naming or traducing of any person in the pulpit, was by him made no scruple. If I shall therefore take licence by the right of nature, and that liberty wherein I was born, to defend myself publicly against a printed calumny, and do willingly appeal to those judges to whom I am accused, it can be no immoderate, or unallowable course of seeking so just and needful reparations. Which I had done long since, had not those employments, which are now visible, deferred me. It was preached before ye, lords and commons! in August last upon a special day of humiliation, that 'there was a wicked book abroad,' and ye were taxed of sin that it was yet 'uncensured, the book deserving to be burnt; and 'Impudence' also was charged upon the author, who durst 'set his name to it, and dedicate it to yourselves!' First, lords and commons! I pray to that God, before whom ye then were prostrate, so to forgive ye those omissions and trespasses, which ye desire most should find forgiveness, as I shall soon shew to the world how easily ye absolve yourselves of that which this man calls your sin, and is indeed your wisdom, and your nobleness, whereof to this day ye have done well not to repent. He terms it 'a wicked book,' and why but 'for allowing other causes of divorce, than Christ and his apostles mention?' and with the same censure condemns of wickedness not only Martin Bucer, that elect instrument of reformation, highly honoured, and had in reverence by Edward the Sixth, and his whole parliament, whom also I had published in English by a good providence, about a week before this calumnious digression was preached; so that if he knew not Bucer then, as he ought to have known, he might at least have known him some months after, ere the sermon came in print; wherein notwithstanding he persists in his former sentence, and condemns again of wickedness, either ignorantly or wilfully, not only Martin Bucer, and all the choicest and holiest of our reformers, but the whole parliament and church of England in those best and purest times of Edward the Sixth. All which I shall prove with good evidence, at the end of these explanations. And then let it be judged and seriously considered with what hope the affairs of our religion are committed to one among others, who hath now only left him which of the twain he will choose, whether this shall be his palpable ignorance, or the same wickedness of his own book, which he so lavishly imputes to the writings of other men: and whether this

of his, that thus peremptorily defames and attaints of wickedness unspotted churches, unblemished parliaments, and the most eminent restorers of christian doctrine, deserve not to be burnt first. And if his heat had burst out only against the opinion, his wonted passion had no doubt been silently borne with wonted patience. But since, against the charity of that solemn place and meeting, it served him further to inveigh opprobriously against the person, branding him with no less than impudence, only for setting his name to what he had written; I must be excused not to be so wanting to the defence of an honest name, or to the reputation of those good men who afford me their society, but to be sensible of such a foul endeavoured disgrace: not knowing aught either in mine own deserts, or the laws of this land, why I should be subject, in such a notorious and illegal manner, to the intemperances of this man's preaching choler. And indeed to be so prompt and ready in the midst of his humbleness, to toss reproaches of this bulk and size, argues as if they were the weapons of his exercise, I am sure not of his ministry, or of that day's work. Certainly to subscribe my name at what I was to own, was what the state had ordered and requires. And he who lists not to be malicious, would call it ingenuity, clear conscience, willingness to avouch what might be questioned, or to be better instructed. And if God were so displeased with those, Isa. lviii. who 'on the solemn fast were wont to smite with the fist of wickedness,' it could be no sign of his own humiliation accepted, which disposed him to smite so keenly with a reviling tongue. But if only to have writ my name must be counted 'impudence,' how doth this but justify another, who might affirm with as good warrant, that the late discourse of 'Scripture and Reason,' which is certain to be chiefly his own draught, was published without a name, out of base fear, and the fly avoidance of what might follow to his detriment, if the party at court should hap to reach him? And I, to have set my name, where he accuses me to have set it, am so far from recanting, that I offer my hand also if need be, to make good the same opinion which I there maintain, by inevitable consequences drawn parallel from his own principal arguments in that of 'Scripture and Reason:' which I shall pardon him, if he can deny, without shaking his own composition to pieces. The 'impudence' therefore, since he weighed so little what a gross revile that was to give his equal, I send him back again for a phylactery to stitch upon his arrogance, that censures not only before conviction, so bitterly without so much as one reason given, but censures the congregation of his governors to their faces, for not being so hasty as himself to censure.

And whereas my other crime is, that I addressed the dedication of what I had studied, to the parliament; how could I better declare the loyalty which I owe to that supreme and majestic tribunal, and the opinion which I have of the high entrusted judgment, and personal worth assembled in that place? With the same affections therefore, and the same addicted fidelity, parliament of England! I here again have brought to your perusal on the same argument these following expositions of scripture. The former book, as pleased some to think, who were thought judicious, had of reason in it to a sufficiency; what they required, was that the scriptures there alledged might be discussed more fully. To their desires, thus much further hath been laboured in the scriptures. Another sort also who wanted more authorities, and citations, have not been here unthought of. If all this attain not to satisfy them, as I am confident that none of those our great controversies at this day hath had a more demonstrative explaining, I must confess to admire what it is: for doubtless it is not reason now-a-days that satisfies, or suborns the common credence of men, to yield so easily, and grow so vehement in matters much more disputable, and far less conducing to the daily good and peace of life. Some whose necessary shifts have long enured them to cloak the defects of their unstudied years, and hatred now to learn, under the appearance of a grave solidity (which estimation they have gained among weak perceivers,) find the ease of slighting what they cannot refute, and are determined, as I hear, to hold it not worth the answering. In which number I must be forced to reckon that doctor, who in a late equivocating treatise plausibly set afloat against the Dippers, diving

diving the while himself with a more deep prelatical malignance against the present state and church-government, mentions with ignominy 'the Tractate of Divorce;' yet answers nothing, but instead thereof (for which I do not commend his marshalling) sets Moses also among the crew of his Anabaptists; as one who to a holy nation, the commonwealth of Israel, gave laws 'breaking the bonds of marriage to inordinate lust.' These are no mean surges of blasphemy, not only dipping Moses the divine lawgiver, but dashing with a high hand against the justice and purity of God himself: as these ensuing scriptures plainly and freely handled, shall verify to the launching of that old apostemated error. Him therefore I leave now to his repentance.

Others, which is their courtesy, confess that wit and parts may do much to make that seem true which is not; (as was objected to Socrates by them who could not resist his efficacy, that he ever made the worst cause seem the better) and thus thinking themselves discharged of the difficulty, love not to wade further into the fear of a convincement. These will be their excuses to decline the full examining of this serious point. So much the more I press it and repeat it, lords and commons! that ye beware while time is, ere this grand secret, and only art of ignorance affecting tyranny, grow powerful, and rule among us. For if sound argument and reason shall be thus put off, either by an undervaluing silence, or the masterly censure of a railing word or two in the pulpit, or by rejecting the force of truth, as the meer cunning of eloquence and sophistry; what can be the end of this, but that all good learning and knowledge will suddenly decay? Ignorance, and illiterate presumption, which is yet but our disease, will turn at length into our very constitution, and prove the hectic evil of this age: worse to be feared, if it get once to reign over us, than any fifth monarchy. If this shall be the course, that what was wont to be a chief commendation, and the ground of other men's confidence in an author, his diligence, his learning, his elocution whether by right, or by ill meaning granted him, shall be turned now to a disadvantage and suspicion against him, that what he writes, though unconfuted, must therefore be mistrusted, therefore not received for the industry, the exactness, the labour in it, confessed to be more than ordinary; as if wisdom had now forsaken the thirsty and laborious enquirer to dwell against her nature with the arrogant and shallow babler; to what purpose all those pains and that continual searching required of us by Solomon to the attainment of understanding? Why are men bred up with such care and expence to a life of perpetual studies? Why do yourselves with such endeavour seek to wipe off the imputation of intending to discourage the progress and advance of learning? He therefore whose heart can bear him to the high pitch of your noble enterprizes, may easily assure himself that the prudence and far-judging circumspectness of so grave a magistracy sitting in parliament, who have before them the prepared and purposed act of their most religious predecessors to imitate in this question, cannot reject the clearness of these reasons, and these allegations both here and formerly offered them; nor can over-look the necessity of ordaining more wholsomly and more humanly in the casualties of divorce, than our laws have yet established, if the most urgent and excessive grievances happening in domestic life, be worth the laying to heart; which, unless charity be far from us, cannot be neglected. And that these things both in the right constitution, and in the right reformation of a commonwealth call for speediest redress, and ought to be the first considered, enough was urged in what was prefaced to that monument of Bucer which I brought to your remembrance, and the other time before. Henceforth, except new cause be given, I shall say less and less. For if the law make not timely provision, let the law, as reason is, bear the censure of those consequences, which her own default now more evidently produces. And if men want manliness to expostulate the right of their due ransom, and to second their own occasions, they may sit hereafter and bemoan themselves to have neglected through faintness the only remedy of their sufferings, which a seasonable and well-grounded speaking might have purchased them.

them. And perhaps in time to come, others will know how to esteem what is not every day put into their hands, when they have marked events, and better weighed how hurtful and unwise it is, to hide a secret and pernicious rupture under the ill counsel of a bashful silence. But who would distrust aught, or not be ample in his hopes of your wise and christian determinations? who have the prudence to consider, and should have the goodness, like Gods, as ye are called, to find out readily, and by just law to administer those redresses which have of old, not without God ordaining, been granted to the adversities of mankind, ere they who needed, were put to ask. Certainly, if any other have enlarged his thoughts to expect from this government, so justly undertaken, and by frequent assistances from Heaven so apparently upheld, glorious changes and renovations both in church and state, he among the foremost might be named, who prays that the fate of England may tarry for no other deliverers.

JOHN MILTON.

T E T R A C H O R D O N : E X P O S I T I O N S

U P O N

The four chief places in Scripture which treat of Marriage, or nullities in marriage.

Genesis I. 27.

So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

28. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, &c.

Gen. II. 18.

And the Lord God said, It is not good that Man should be alone, I will make him a help-meet for him.

23. And Adam said, this is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man.

24. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh.

Gen. I. 27.

‘S O God created man in his own image.’] To be informed aright in the whole History of marriage, that we may know for certain, not by a forced yoke, but by an impartial definition, what marriage is, and what is not marriage: it will undoubtedly be safest, fairest, and most with our obedience, to enquire, as our Saviour’s direction is, how it was in the beginning. And that we begin so high as man created after God’s own image, there want not earnest causes. For nothing now a-days is more degenerately forgotten, than the true dignity of man, almost in every respect, but especially in this prime institution of matrimony, wherein his native pre-eminence ought most to shine. Although if we consider that just and natural privileges men neither can rightly seek, nor dare fully claim, unless they be allied to inward goodness and stedfast knowledge, and that the want of this quells them to a servile sense of their own conscious unworthiness; it may save the wondring why in this age many are so opposite both to human and to christian liberty, either while they understand not, or envy others that do; contenting, or rather priding themselves in a specious humility and strictness bred out of low ignorance, that never yet conceived the freedom of the gospel; and is therefore by the apostle to the Colossians ranked with no better company, than will-worship and the meer shew of wisdom. And how injurious herein they are, if not to themselves, yet to their neighbours, and not to them only, but to the all-wise and bounteous grace offered us in our redemption; will orderly appear.

‘ In the image of God created he him.] It is enough determined, that this image of God wherein man was created, is meant wisdom, purity, justice, and rule over all creatures. All which being lost in Adam, was recovered with gain by the merits of Christ. For albeit our first parent had lordship over sea, and land, and air, yet there was a law without him, as a guard set over him. But Christ having cancelled the hand-writing of

of ordinances which was against us, Coloss. ii. 14. and interpreted the fulfilling of all through charity, hath in that respect set us over law, in the free custody of his love, and left us victorious under the guidance of his living spirit, not under the dead letter; to follow that which most edifies, most aids and furthers a religious life, makes us holiest and likest to his immortal image, not that which makes us most conformable and captive to civil and subordinate precepts; whereof the strictest observance may oft-times prove the destruction not only of many innocent persons and families, but of whole nations. Although indeed no ordinance human or from heaven can bind against the good of man; so that to keep them strictly against that end, is all one with to break them. Men of most renowned virtue have sometimes by transgressing, most truly kept the law; and wisest magistrates have permitted and dispensed it; while they looked not peevishly at the letter, but with a greater spirit at the good of mankind, if always not written in the characters of law, yet engraven in the heart of man by a divine impression. This Heathens could see, as the well-read in story can recount of Solon and Epaminondas, whom Cicero in his first book of 'Invention' nobly defends. 'All law' saith he, 'we ought to refer to the common good, and interpret by that, not by the scrawl of letters. No man observes law for law's sake, but for the good of them for whom it was made. The rest might serve well to lecture these times, deluded through belly doctrines into a devout slavery. The scripture also affords us David in the shew-bread, Hezekiah in the passover, sound and safe transgressors of the literal command, which also dispensed not seldom with itself; and taught us on what just occasions to do so: until our Saviour, for whom that great and god-like work was reserved, redeemed us to a state above prescriptions, by dissolving the whole law into charity. And have we not the soul to understand this, and must we against this glory of God's transcendent love towards us be still the servants of a literal indictment?

'Created he him.'] It might be doubted why he saith, 'In the image of God created he him,' not them, as well as 'male and female' them; especially since that image might be common to them both, but male and female could not, however the Jews fable, and please themselves with the accidental concurrence of Plato's wit, as if man at first had been created Hermaphrodite: but then it must have been male and female created he him. So had the image of God been equally common to them both, it had no doubt been said, in the image of God created he them. But St. Paul ends the controversy, by explaining that the woman is not primarily and immediately the image of God, but in reference to the man. 'The head of the woman,' saith he, 1 Cor. 11. 'is the man: he the image and glory of God, she the glory of the man; he not for her, but she for him. Therefore his precept is, wives be subject to your husbands as is fit in the Lord,' Coloss. iii. 18. 'In every thing,' Eph. v. 24. Nevertheless man is not to hold her as a servant, but receives her into a part of that empire which Gods proclaims him to, though not equally, yet largely, as his own image and glory: for it is no small glory to him, that a creature so like him, should be made subject to him. Not but that particular exceptions may have place, if she exceed her husband in prudence and dexterity, and he contentedly yield: for then a superior and more natural law comes in, that the wiser should govern the less wise, whether male or female. But that which far more easily and obediently follows from this verse, is that, seeing woman was purposely made for man, and he her head, it cannot stand before the breath of this divine utterance, that man the portraiture of God, joining to himself for his intended good and solace an inferior sex, should so become her thrall, whose wilfulness or inability to be a wife frustrates the occasional end of her creation; but that he may acquit himself to freedom by his natural birth-right, and that indelible character of priority which God crowned him with. If it be urged that sin hath lost him this, the answer is not far to seek, that from her the sin first proceeded, which keeps her justly in the same proportion still beneath. She is not to gain by being first in the transgression, that man should further

lose to her, because already he hath lost by her means. Oft it happens that in this matter he is without fault; so that his punishment herein is causeless: and God hath the praise in our speeches of him, to sort his punishment in the same kind with the offence. Suppose he erred; it is not the intent of God or man, to hunt an error so to the death with a revenge beyond all measure and proportion. But if we argue thus, this affliction is befallen him for his sin, therefore he must bear it, without seeking the only remedy: first, it will be false that all affliction comes for sin, as in the case of Job, and of the man born blind, Joh. ix. 3. was evident: next, by that reason, all miseries coming for sin, we must let them all lie upon us like the vermin of an Indian Catharist, which his fond religion forbids him to molest. Were it a particular punishment inflicted through the anger of God upon a person, or upon a land, no law hinders us in that regard, no law but bids us remove it if we can; much more if it be a dangerous temptation withal; much more yet, if it be certainly a temptation, and not certainly a punishment, though a pain. As for what they say we must bear with patience; to bear with patience, and to seek effectual remedies, implies no contradiction. It may no less be for our disobedience, our unfaithfulness, and other sins against God, that wives become adulterous to the bed; and questionless we ought to take the affliction as patiently as Christian prudence would wish: yet hereby is not lost the right of divorcing for adultery. No, you say, because our Saviour excepted that only. But why, if he were so bent to punish our sins, and try our patience in binding on us a disastrous marriage, why did he except adultery? Certainly to have been bound from divorce in that case also had been as plentiful a punishment to our sins, and not too little work for the patientest. Nay, perhaps they will say it was too great a sufferance; and with as slight a reason, for no wise man but would sooner pardon the act of adultery once and again committed by a person worth pity and forgiveness, than to lead a wearisome life of unloving and unquiet conversation with one who neither affects nor is affected, much less with one who exercises all bitterness, and would commit adultery too, but for envy lest the persecuted condition should thereby get the benefit of his freedom. 'Tis plain therefore, that God enjoins not this supposed strictness of not divorcing either to punish us, or to try our patience.

Moreover, if man be the image of God, which consists in holiness, and woman ought in the same respect to be the image and companion of man, in such wise to be loved as the church is beloved of Christ; and if, as God is the head of Christ, and Christ the head of man, so man is the head of woman; I cannot see by this golden dependance of headship and subjection, but that piety and religion is the main tie of Christian matrimony: so as if there be found between the pair a notorious disparity either of wickedness or heresy, the husband by all manner of right is disengaged from a creature, not made and inflicted on him to the vexation of his righteousness: the wife also, as her subjection is terminated in the Lord, being herself the redeemed of Christ, is not still bound to be the vassal of him, who is the bond-slave of Satan: she being now neither the image nor the glory of such a person, nor made for him, nor left in bondage to him; but hath recourse to the wing of charity, and protection of the church, unless there be a hope on either side: yet such a hope must be meant, as may be a rational hope, and not an endless servitude. Of which hereafter.

But usually it is objected, that if it be thus, then there can be no true marriage between misbelievers and irreligious persons. I might answer, let them see to that who are such; the church hath no commission to judge those without, 1 Cor. v. But this they will say perhaps, is but penuriously to resolve a doubt. I answer therefore, that where they are both irreligious, the marriage may be yet true enough to them in a civil relation. For there are left some remains of God's image in man, as he is merely man; which reason God gives against the shedding of man's blood, Gen ix. as being made in God's image, without expressing whether he were a good man or a bad, to exempt the

slayer from punishment. So that in those marriages where the parties are alike void of religion, the wife owes a civil homage and subjection, the husband owes a civil loyalty. But where the yoke is mis-yoked, heretic with faithful, godly with ungodly, to the grievance and manifest endangering of a brother or sister, reasons of a higher strain than matrimonial bear sway; unless the gospel instead of freeing us, debase itself to make us bond-men, and suffer evil to controul good.

‘Male and female created he them.’] This contains another end of matching man and woman, being the right and lawfulness of the marriage-bed; though much inferior to the former end of her being his image and help in religious society. And who of weakest insight may not see that this creating of them male and female, cannot in any order of reason, or christianity, be of such moment against the better and higher purposes of their creation, as to enthrall husband or wife to duties or to sufferings, unworthy and unbecoming the image of God in them? Now whenas not only men, but good men, do stand upon their right, their estimation, their dignity, in all other actions and deportments, with warrant enough and good conscience, as having the image of God in them, it will not be difficult to determine what is unworthy and unseemly for a man to do or suffer in wedlock: and the like proportionally may be found for woman, if we love not to stand disputing below the principles of humanity. He that said, ‘Male and female created he them,’ immediately before that said also in the same verse, ‘In the image of God created he him,’ and redoubled it, that our thoughts might not be so full of dregs as to urge this poor consideration of male and female, without remembering the nobleness of that former repetition; lest when God sends a wise eye to examine our trivial glosses, they be found extremely to creep upon the ground: especially since they confess that what here concerns marriage is but a brief touch, only preparative to the institution which follows more expressly in the next chapter; and that Christ so took it, as desiring to be briefest with them who came to tempt him, account shall be given in due place.

Ver. 28. ‘And God blessed them, and God said unto them, be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth,’ &c.

This declares another end of matrimony, the propagation of mankind; and is again repeated to Noah and his sons. Many things might be noted on this place not ordinary, nor unworth the noting; but I undertook not a general comment. Hence therefore we see the desire of children is honest and pious; if we be not less zealous in our christianity than Plato was in his heathenism; who in the sixth ‘of his laws,’ counts off-spring therefore desirable, that we may leave in our stead sons of our sons, continual servants of God: a religious and prudent desire, if people knew as well what were required to breeding as to begetting; which desire perhaps was a cause why the Jews hardly could endure a barren wedlock: and Philo, in his book of special laws, esteems him only worth pardon that sends not barrenness away. Carvilius, the first recorded in Rome to have sought divorce, had it granted him for the barrenness of his wife, upon his oath that he married to the end he might have children; as Dionysius and Gellius are authors. But to dismiss a wife only for barrenness, is hard: and yet in some the desire of children is so great, and so just, yea sometime so necessary, that to condemn such a one to a childless age, the fault apparently not being in him, might seem perhaps more strict than needed. Sometimes inheritances, crowns, and dignities are so interested and annexed in their common peace and good to such or such lineal descent, that it may prove of great moment both in the affairs of men and of religion, to consider thoroughly what might be done herein, notwithstanding the waywardness of our school doctors.

Gen. II. 18.

‘ And the Lord said, It is not good that man should be alone ; I will make him a help-meet for him.’

Ver. 23. ‘ And Adam said, &c.’ Ver. 24. ‘ Therefore shall a man leave, &c.’

THIS second chapter is granted to be a commentary on the first, and these verses granted to be an exposition of that former verse, ‘ Male and female created he them :’ and yet when this male and female is by the explicate words of God himself here declared to be not meant other than a fit help, and meet society ; some who would ingross to themselves the whole trade of interpreting, will not suffer the clear text of God to do the office of explaining itself.

‘ And the Lord God said, it is not good.]’ A man would think that the consideration of who spake, should raise up the intention of our minds to enquire better, and obey the purpose of so great a speaker : for as we order the business of marriage, that which he here speaks is all made vain ; and in the decision of matrimony, or not matrimony, nothing at all regarded. Our presumption hath utterly changed the state and condition of this ordinance : God ordained it in love and helpfulness to be indissoluble, and we in outward act and formality to be a forced bondage ; so that being subject to a thousand errors in the best men, if it prove a blessing to any, it is of mere accident, as man’s law hath handled it, and not of institution.

‘ It is not good for man to be alone.]’ Hitherto all things that have been named, were approved of God to be very good : loneliness is the first thing which God’s eye named not good : whether it be a thing, or the want of something, I labour not ; let it be their tendance, who have the art to be industriously idle. And here ‘ alone’ is meant alone without woman ; otherwise Adam had the company of God himself, and angels to converse with ; all creatures to delight him seriously, or to make him sport. God could have created him out of the same mould a thousand friends and brother Adams to have been his consorts ; yet for all this till Eve was given him, God reckoned him to be alone.

‘ It is not good.]’ God here presents himself like to a man deliberating ; both to shew us that the matter is of high consequence, and that he intended to found it according to natural reason, not impulsive command ; but that the duty should arise from the reason of it, not the reason be swallowed up in a reasonless duty. ‘ Not good,’ was as much to Adam before his fall, as not pleasing, not expedient ; but since the coming of sin into the world, to him who hath not received the continence, it is not only not expedient to be alone, but plainly sinful. And therefore he who willfully abstains from marriage, not being supernaturally gifted, and he who by making the yoke of marriage unjust and intolerable, causes men to abhor it, are both in a diabolical sin, equal to that of antichrist, who forbids to marry. For what difference at all whether he abstain men from marrying, or restrain them in a marriage happening totally discommodious, distasteful, dishonest and pernicious to him without the appearance of his fault ? For God does not here precisely say, I make a female to this male, as he did before ; but expounding himself here on purpose, he saith, because it is not good for man to be alone, I make him therefore a meet help. God supplies the privation of not good, with the perfect gift of a real and positive good : it is man’s perverse cooking who hath turned this bounty of God into a scorpion, either by weak and shallow constructions, or by proud arrogance and cruelty to them who neither in their purposes nor in their actions have offended against the due honour of wedlock.

Now whereas the Apostle’s speaking in the spirit, 1 Cor. vii. pronounces quite contrary to this word of God, ‘ It is good for a man not to touch a woman,’ and God cannot contradict himself ; it instructs us that his commands and words, especially such as bear the manifest title of some good to man, are not to be so strictly wrung, as to com-

mand without regard to the most natural and miserable necessities of mankind. Therefore the Apostle adds a limitation in the 26th verse of that chapter, for the present necessity it is good; which he gives us doubtless as a pattern how to reconcile other places by the general rule of charity.

‘For man to be alone.’] Some would have the sense hereof to be in respect of procreation only: and Austin contests that manly friendship in all other regards had been a more becoming solace for Adam, than to spend so many secret years in an empty world with one woman. But our writers deservedly reject this crabbed opinion; and defend that there is a peculiar comfort in the married state beside the genial bed, which no other society affords. No mortal nature can endure either in the actions of religion, or study of wisdom, without sometime slackening the cords of intense thought and labour: which lest we should think faulty, God himself conceals us not his own recreations before the world was built; ‘I was,’ saith the eternal wisdom, ‘daily his delight, playing always before him.’ And to him indeed wisdom is as a high tower of pleasure, but to us a steep hill, and we toiling ever about the bottom: he executes with ease the exploits of his omnipotence, as easy as with us it is to will: but no worthy enterprize can be done by us without continual plodding and wearisomeness to our faint and sensitive abilities. We cannot therefore always be contemplative, or pragmatical abroad, but have need of some delightful intermissions, wherein the enlarged soul may leave off a while her severe schooling; and like a glad youth in wandring vacancy, may keep her holidays to joy and harmless pastime: which as she cannot well do without company, so in no company so well as where the different sex in most resembling unlikeness, and most unlike resemblance, cannot but please best, and be pleased in the aptitude of that variety. Whereof lest we should be too timorous, in the awe that our flat sages would form us and dress us, wisest Solomon among his gravest Proverbs countenances a kind of ravishment and erring fondness in the entertainment of wedded leisures; and in the song of songs, which is generally believed, even in the jolliest expressions, to figure the spousals of the Church with Christ, sings of a thousand raptures between those two lovely ones far on the hither side of carnal enjoyment. By these instances, and more which might be brought, we may imagine how indulgently God provided against man’s loneliness; that he approved it not, as by himself declared not good; that he approved the remedy thereof, as of his own ordaining, consequently good: and as he ordained it, so doubtless proportionably to our fallen estate he gives it; else were his ordinance at least in vain, and we for all his gifts still empty handed. Nay, such an unbounteous giver we should make him, as in the fables Jupiter was to Ixion, giving him a cloud instead of Juno, giving him a monstrous issue by her, the breed of Centaurs, a neglected and unloved race, the fruits of a delusive marriage; and lastly, giving him her with a damnation to that wheel in hell, from a life thrown into the midst of temptations and disorders. But God is no deceitful giver, to bestow that on us for a remedy of loneliness, which if it bring not a sociable mind as well as a conjunctive body, leaves us no less alone than before; and if it bring a mind perpetually averse and disagreeable, betrays us to a worse condition than the most deserted loneliness. God cannot in the justice of his own promise and institution so unexpectedly mock us, by forcing that upon us as the remedy of solitude, which wraps us in a misery worse than any wilderness, as the spirit of God himself judges, Prov. xix. especially knowing that the best and wisest men amidst the sincere and most cordial designs of their heart, do daily err in choosing. We may conclude therefore, seeing orthodoxal expositors confess to our hands, that by loneliness is not only meant the want of copulation, and that man is not less alone by turning in a body to him, unless there be within it a mind answerable; that it is a work more worthy the care and consultation of God to provide for the worthiest part of man which is his mind, and not unnaturally to set it beneath the formalities and respects of the body, to make it a servant of its own vassal: I say, we may conclude that such a marriage, wherein the mind is so disgraced and vilified

fied below the body's interest, and can have no just or tolerable contentment, is not of God's institution, and therefore no marriage. Nay, in concluding this, I say we conclude no more than what the common expositors themselves give us, both in that which I have recited, and much more hereafter. But the truth is, they give us, in such a manner, as they who leave their own mature positions like the eggs of an ostrich in the dust; I do but lay them in the sun; their own pregnancies hatch the truth; and I am taxed of novelties and strange producements, while they, like that inconsiderate bird, know not that these are their own natural breed.

'I will make him a help-meet for him.'] Here the heavenly institutor, as if he laboured not to be mistaken by the supercilious hypocrisy of those that love to master their brethren, and to make us sure that he gave us not now a servile yoke, but an amiable knot, contents not himself to say, I will make him a wife; but resolving to give us first the meaning before the name of a wife, saith graciously, 'I will make him a help meet for him.' And here again, as before, I do not require more full and fair deductions than the whole consent of our divines usually raise from this text, that in matrimony there must be first a mutual help to piety, next to civil fellowship of love and amity, then to generation, so to household affairs, lastly the remedy of incontinence. And commonly they reckon them in such order, as leaves generation and incontinence to be last considered. This I amaze me at, that though all the superior and nobler ends both of marriage and of the married persons be absolutely frustrate, the matrimony stirs not, loses no hold, remains as rooted as the center: but if the body bring but in a complaint of frigidity, by that cold application only, this adamant Alpe of wedlock has leave to dissolve; which else all the machinations of religious or civil reason at the suit of a distressed mind, either for divine worship or human conversation violated, cannot unfasten. What courts of concupiscence are these, wherein fleshly appetite is heard before right reason, lust before love or devotion? They may be pious christians together, they may be loving and friendly, they may be helpful to each other in the family, but they cannot couple; that shall divorce them, tho' either party would not. They can neither serve God together, nor one be at peace with the other, nor be good in the family one to other, but live as they were dead, or live as they were deadly enemies in a cage together; it is all one, they can couple, they shall not divorce till death, no though this sentence be their death. What is this, besides tyranny, but to turn nature upside down, to make both religion, and the mind of man wait upon the slavish errands of the body, and not the body to follow either the sanctity, or the sovereignty of the mind, unspeakably wronged, and with all equity complaining? What is this but to abuse the sacred and mysterious bed of marriage to be the compulsive sty of an ingrateful and malignant lust, stirred up only from a carnal acrimony, without either love or peace, or regard to any other thing holy or human. This I admire how possibly it should inhabit thus long in the sense of so many disputing Theologians, unless it be the lowest lees of a canonical infection liver-grown to their sides; which perhaps will never uncling, without the strong absterfice of some heroic magistrate, whose mind, equal to his high office, dares lead him both to know and to do without their frivolous case-putting. For certain he shall have God and this institution plainly on his side. And if it be true both in divinity and law, that consent alone, though copulation never follow, makes a marriage; how can they dissolve it for the want of that which made it not, and not dissolve it for that not continuing which made it, and should preserve it in love and reason, and difference it from a brute conjugality?

'Meet for him.'] The original here is more expressive than other languages word for word can render it; but all agree effectual conformity of disposition and affection to be hereby signified; which God as it were, not satisfied with the naming of a help, goes on describing another self, a second self, a very self itself. Yet now there is nothing in the life of man, through our misconstruction, made more uncertain, more hazardous and full of chance than this divine blessing with such favourable significance here conferred upon
us;

us; which if we do but err in our choice, the most unblameable error that can be, err but one minute, one moment after those mighty syllables pronounced, which take upon them to join heaven and hell together unpardonably till death pardon: this divine blessing that looked but now with such a humane smile upon us, and spoke such gentle reason, strait vanishes like a fair sky, and brings on such a scene of cloud and tempest, as turns all to shipwreck without haven or shore, but to a ransomless captivity. And then they tell us it is our sin: but let them be told again, that sin through the mercy of God hath not made such waste upon us, as to make utterly void to our use any temporal benefit, much less any so much availing to a peaceful and sanctified life, merely for a most incident error which no wariness can certainly shun. And wherefore serves our happy redemption, and the liberty we have in Christ, but to deliver us from calamitous yokes, not to be lived under without the endangerment of our souls, and to restore us in some competent measure to a right in every good thing both of this life, and the other? Thus we see how treatably and distinctly God hath here taught us what the prime ends of marriage are; mutual solace and help. That we are now, upon the most irreprehensible mistake in chusing, defeated and defrauded of all this original benignity, was begun first through the snare of antichristian canons long since obtruded upon the Church of Rome, and not yet scoured off by reformation, out of a lingring vain-glory that abides among us to make fair shews in formal ordinances, and to enjoin continence and bearing of crosses in such a garb as no Scripture binds us, under the thickest arrows of temptation, where we need not stand. Now we shall see with what acknowledgment and assent Adam received this new associate which God brought him.

Ver. 23. 'And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man.'

That there was a nearer alliance between Adam and Eve, than could be ever after between man and wife, is visible to any. For no other woman was ever moulded out of her husband's rib, but of mere strangers for the most part they come to have that consanguinity which they have by wedlock. And if we look nearly upon the matter, though marriage be most agreeable to holiness, to purity and justice, yet is it not a natural, but a civil and ordained relation. For if it were in nature, no law or crime could disannul it, to make a wife, or husband, otherwise than still a wife or husband, but only death; as nothing but that can make a father no father, or a son no son. But divorce for adultery or desertion, as all our Churches agree but England, not only separates, but nullifies, and extinguishes the relation itself of matrimony, so that they are no more man and wife; otherwise the innocent party could not marry elsewhere, without the guilt of adultery. Next, were it merely natural, why was it here ordained more than the rest of moral law to man in his original rectitude, in whose breast all that was natural or moral was engraven without external constitutions and edicts? Adam therefore in these words does not establish an indissoluble bond of marriage in the carnal ligaments of flesh and bones; for if he did, it would belong only to himself in the literal sense, every one of us being nearer in flesh of flesh, and bone of bones to our parents than to a wife; they therefore were not to be left for her in that respect. But Adam, who had the wisdom given him to know all creatures, and to name them according to their properties, no doubt but had the gift to discern perfectly that which concerned him much more; and to apprehend at first sight the true fitness of that consort which God provided him. And therefore spake in reference to those words which God pronounced before; as if he had said, this is she by whose meet help and society I shall no more be alone; this is she who was made my image, even as I the image of God; not so much in body, as in unity of mind and heart. And he might as easily know what were the words of God, as he knew so readily what had been done with his rib, while he slept so soundly. He might well know, if God took

a rib out of his inside, to form of it a double good to him, he would far sooner disjoin it from his outside, to prevent a treble mischief to him; and far sooner cut it quite off from all relation for his undoubted ease, than nail it into his body again, to stick for ever there a thorn in his heart. Whenas nature teaches us to divide any limb from the body to the saving of its fellows, though it be the maiming and deformity of the whole; how much more is it her doctrine to sever by incision, not a true limb so much, though that be lawful, but an adherent, a sore, the gangrene of a limb, to the recovery of a whole man? But if in these words we shall make Adam to erect a new establishment of marriage in the meer flesh, which God so lately had instituted, and founded in the sweet and mild familiarity of love and solace, and mutual fitness; what do we but use the mouth of our general parent, the first time it opens, to an arrogant opposition and correcting of God's wiser ordinance? These words therefore cannot import any thing new in marriage, but either that which belongs to Adam only, or to us in reference only to the instituting words of God, which made a meet help against loneliness. Adam spake like Adam the words of flesh and bones, the shell and rind of matrimony; but God spake like God, of love and solace and meet help, the soul both of Adam's words and of matrimony.

V. 24. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh.

This verse, as our common herd expounds it, is the great knot-tier, which hath undone by tying, and by tangling, millions of guiltless consciences: this is that grisly porter, who having drawn men and wisest men by subtle allurements within the train of an unhappy matrimony, claps the dungeon-gate upon them, as irrecoverable as the grave. But if we view him well, and hear him with not too hasty and prejudicant ears, we shall find no such terror in him. For first, it is not here said absolutely without all reason he shall cleave to his wife, be it to his weal or to his destruction as it happens, but he shall do this upon the premises and considerations of that meet help and society before mentioned. 'Therefore he shall cleave to his wife,' no otherwise a wife than a fit help. He is not bid to leave the dear cohabitation of his father, mother, brothers and sisters, to link himself inseparably with the mere carcass of a marriage, perhaps an enemy. This joining particle 'Therefore' is in all equity, nay in all necessity of construction to comprehend first and most principally what God spake concerning the inward essence of marriage in his institution, that we may learn how far to attend what Adam spake of the outward materials thereof in his approbation. For if we shall bind these words of Adam only to a corporal meaning, and that the force of this injunction upon all us his sons to live individually with any woman which hath befallen us in the most mistaken wedlock, shall consist not in those moral and relative causes of Eve's creation, but in the meer anatomy of a rib, and that Adam's insight concerning wedlock reached no further, we shall make him as very an idiot as the Socinians make him; which would not be reverently done of us. Let us be content to allow our great forefather so much wisdom, as to take the instituting words of God along with him into this sentence, which if they be well minded, will assure us that flesh and ribs are but of a weak and dead efficacy to keep marriage united where there is no other fitness. The rib of marriage, to all since Adam, is a relation much rather than a bone; the nerves and sinews thereof are love and meet help, they knit not every couple that marries, and where they knit they seldom break; but where they break, which for the most part is where they were never truly joined, to such at the same instant both flesh and rib cease to be in common: so that here they argue nothing to the continuance of a false or violated marriage, but must be led back again to receive their meaning from those institutive words of God which give them all the life and vigour they have.

‘Therefore shall a man leave his father, &c.’] What to a man’s thinking more plain by this appointment, that the fatherly power should give place to conjugal prerogative? Yet it is generally held by reformed writers against the papist, that though in persons at discretion the marriage in itself be never so fit, though it be fully accomplished with benediction, board and bed, yet the father not consenting, his main will without dispute shall dissolve all. And this they affirm only from collective reason, not any direct law; for that in Exod. xxii. 17. which is most particular, speaks that a father may refuse to marry his daughter to one who hath deflowered her, not that he may take her away from one who hath soberly married her. Yet because the general honour due to parents is great, they hold he may, and perhaps hold not amiss. But again, when the question is of harsh and rugged parents, who defer to bestow their children seasonably, they agree jointly that the church or magistrate may bestow them, though without the father’s consent: and for this they have no express authority in scripture. So that they may see by their own handling of this very place, that it is not the stubborn letter must govern us, but the divine and softening breath of charity which turns and winds the dictate of every positive command, and shapes it to the good of mankind. Shall the outward accessory of a father’s will wanting, rend the fittest and most affectionate marriage in twain, after all nuptial consummations; and shall not the want of love and the privation of all civil and religious concord, which is the inward essence of wedlock, do as much to part those who were never truly wedded? Shall a father have this power to vindicate his own wilful honour and authority to the utter breach of a most dearly-united marriage, and shall not a man in his own power have the permission to free his soul, his life, and all his comfort of life from the disaster of a no-marriage? Shall fatherhood, which is but man, for his own pleasure dissolve matrimony; and shall not matrimony, which is God’s ordinance, for its own honour and better conservation, dissolve itself, when it is wrong, and not fitted to any of the chief ends which it owes us?

‘And they shall be one flesh.’] These words also infer that there ought to be an individuality in marriage; but without all question presuppose the joining causes. Not a rule yet that we have met with, so universal in this whole institution, but hath admitted limitations and conditions according to human necessity. The very foundation of matrimony, though God laid it deliberately, ‘that it is not good for man to be alone,’ holds not always, if the apostle can secure us. Soon after we are bid leave father and mother, and cleave to a wife, but must understand the father’s consent withal, else not. ‘Cleave to a wife,’ but let her be a wife, let her be a meet help, a solace, not a nothing, not an adversary, not a desertrice; can any law or command be so unreasonable as to make men cleave to calamity, to ruin, to perdition? In like manner here, ‘they shall be one flesh;’ but let the causes hold, and be made really good, which only have the possibility to make them one flesh. We know that flesh can neither join, nor keep together two bodies of itself; what is it then must make them one flesh, but likeness, but fitness of mind and disposition, which may breed the spirit of concord, and union between them? If that be not in the nature of either, and that there has been a remediless mistake, as vain we go about to compel them into one flesh, as if we undertook to weave a garment of dry sand. It were more easy to compel the vegetable and nutritive power of nature to assimilations and mixtures which are not alterable each by other; or force the concoctive stomach to turn that into flesh which is so totally unlike that substance, as not to be wrought on. For as the unity of mind is nearer and greater than the union of bodies, so doubtless is the dissimilitude greater and more dividual, as that which makes between bodies all difference and distinction. Especially whenas besides the singular and substantial differences of every soul, there is an intimate quality of good or evil, through the whole progeny of Adam, which like a radical heat, or mortal chillness, joins them, or disjoins them irresistibly. In whom therefore either the will, or the faculty is found to have never joined, or now not to continue so, ’tis not to say, they shall be one flesh, for they cannot

not be one flesh. God commands not impossibilities; and all the ecclesiastical glue, that liturgy or laymen can compound, is not able to fodder up two such incongruous natures into the one flesh of a true befitting marriage. Why did Moses then set down their uniting into one flesh? And I again ask, why the gospel so oft repeats the eating of our Saviour's flesh, the drinking of his blood? 'That we are one body with him, the members of his body, flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone.' Ephes. v. Yet lest we should be Capernaitans, as we are told there, that the flesh profiteth nothing; so we are told here, if we be not as deaf as adders, that this union of the flesh proceeds from the union of a fit help and solace. We know that there was never a more spiritual mystery than this gospel taught us under the terms of body and flesh; yet nothing less intended than that we should stick there. What a stupidity then is it, that in marriage, which is the nearest resemblance of our union with Christ, we should deject ourselves to such a sluggish and underfoot philosophy, as to esteem the validity of marriage merely by the flesh, though never so broken and disjointed from love and peace, which only can give a human qualification to that act of the flesh, and distinguish it from bestial. The text therefore uses this phrase, that 'they shall be one flesh,' to justify and make legitimate the rites of marriage-bed; which was not unneedful, if for all this warrant they were suspected of pollution by some sects of philosophy, and religions of old, and latelier among the papists, and other heretics elder than they. Some think there is a high mystery in those words, from that which Paul saith of them, Ephes. v. 'This is a great mystery, but I speak of Christ and the Church:' and thence they would conclude marriage to be inseparable. For me I dispute not now whether matrimony be a mystery or no; if it be of Christ and his church, certainly it is not meant of every ungodly and miswedded marriage, but then only mysterious, when it is a holy, happy, and peaceful match. But when a saint is joined with a reprobate, or both alike wicked with wicked, fool with fool, a he-drunkard with a she; when the bed hath been nothing else for twenty years or more, but an old haunt of lust and malice mixt together, no love, no goodness, no loyalty, but counterplotting, and secret wishing one another's dissolution; this is to me the greatest mystery in the world, if such a marriage as this can be the mystery of aught, unless it be the mystery of iniquity: According to that which Paræus cites out of Chrysostom, that a bad wife is a help for the devil, and the like may be said of a bad husband. Since therefore none but a fit and pious matrimony can signify the union of Christ and his church, there cannot hence be any hindrance of divorce to that wedlock wherein there can be no good mystery. Rather it might to a christian conscience be matter of finding it self so much less satisfied than before, in the continuance of an unhappy yoke, wherein there can be no representation either of Christ, or of his church.

Thus having enquired the institution how it was in the beginning, both from the 1 chap. of Gen. where it was only mentioned in part, and from the second, where it was plainly and evidently instituted; and having attended each clause and word necessary with a diligence not drowsy, we shall now fix with some advantage, and by a short view backward gather up the ground we have gone, and sum up the strength we have, into one argumentative head, with that organic force that Logic proffers us. All arts acknowledge that then only we know certainly, when we can define; for definition is that which refines the pure essence of things from the circumstance. If therefore we can attain in this our controversy to define exactly what marriage is, we shall soon learn when there is a nullity thereof, and when a divorce.

The part therefore of this chapter which hath been here treated, doth orderly and readily resolve itself into a definition of marriage, and a consecratory from thence. To the definition these words chiefly contribute; 'It is not good,' &c. 'I will make, &c.' Where the consecratory begins this connection, 'Therefore' informs us, 'Therefore shall a man, &c.' Definition is decreed by logicians to consist only of causes constituting the

essence of a thing. What is not therefore among the causes constituting marriage, must not stay in the definition. Those causes are concluded to be matter, and, as the artist calls it, Form. But inasmuch as the same thing may be a cause more ways than one, and that in relations and institutions which have no corporal subsistence, but only a respective being, the Form by which the thing is what it is, is oft so slender and undistinguishable, that it would soon confuse, were it not sustained by the efficient and final causes, which concur to make up the form invalid otherwise of itself, it will be needful to take in all the four causes into the definition. First therefore the material cause of matrimony is man and woman; the author and efficient, God and their consent; the internal Form and Soul of this relation, is conjugal love arising from a mutual fitness to the final causes of wedlock, help and society in religious, civil and domestic conversation, which includes as an inferior end the fulfilling of natural desire, and specifical increase; these are the final causes both moving the Efficient, and perfecting the Form. And although copulation be considered among the ends of marriage, yet the act thereof in a right esteem can no longer be matrimonial, than it is an effect of conjugal love. When love finds itself utterly unmatched, and justly vanishes, nay rather cannot but vanish, the fleshly act indeed may continue, but not holy, not pure, not befitting the sacred bond of marriage; being at best but an animal excretion, but more truly worse and more ignoble than that mute kindliness among the herds and flocks: in that proceeding as it ought from intellectual principles, it participates of nothing rational, but that which the field and the fold equals. For in human actions the soul is the agent, the body in a manner passive. If then the body do out of sensitive force, what the soul complies not with, how can man, and not rather something beneath man, be thought the doer?

But to proceed in the pursuit of an accurate definition, it will avail us something, and whet our thoughts, to examine what fabric hereof others have already reared. Paræus on Gen. defines marriage to be 'an indissoluble conjunction of one man and one woman to an individual and intimate conversation, and mutual benevolence,' &c. Wherein is to be marked his placing of intimate conversation before bodily benevolence; for bodily is meant, though indeed 'benevolence' rather sounds will than body. Why then shall divorce be granted for want of bodily performance, and not for want of fitness to intimate conversation, whenas corporal benevolence cannot in any human fashion be without this? Thus his definition places the ends of marriage in one order, and esteems them in another. His Tautology also of indissoluble and individual is not to be imitated; especially since neither indissoluble nor individual hath ought to do in the exact definition, being but a consecutory flowing from thence, as appears by plain scripture, 'Therefore shall a man leave, &c.' For marriage is not true marriage by being individual, but therefore individual, if it be true marriage. No argument but causes enter the definition: a consecutory is but the effect of those causes. Besides, that marriage is indissoluble, is not Catholicly true; we know it dissoluble for adultery, and for desertion by the verdict of all reformed churches. Dr. Ames defines it 'an individual conjunction of one man and one woman, to communion of body and mutual society of life.' But this perverts the order of God, who in the institution places meet help and society of life before communion of body. And vulgar estimation undervalues beyond comparison all society of life and communion of mind beneath the communion of body; granting no divorce, but to the want, or miscommunicating of that. Hemingius, an approved author, Melancthon's scholar, and who, next to Bucer and Erasmus, writes of divorce most like a divine, thus comprises, Marriage is a conjunction of one man and one woman lawfully consenting, into one flesh, for mutual help's sake, ordained of God. And in his explanation stands punctually upon the conditions of consent, that it be not in any main matter deluded, as being the life of wedlock and no true marriage without a true consent. 'Into one flesh' he expounds into one mind, as well as one body, and makes

makes it the formal cause: Herein only missing, while he puts the effect into his definition instead of the cause which the text affords him. For 'one flesh' is not the formal essence of wedlock, but one end, or one effect of 'a meet help.' The end oft-times being the effect and fruit of the form, as logic teaches: Else many aged and holy matrimonyes, and more eminently that of Joseph and Mary, would be no true marriage. And that maxim generally received, would be false, that 'consent alone, though copulation never follow, makes the marriage.' Therefore to consent lawfully into one flesh, is not the formal cause of matrimony, but only one of the effects. The civil lawyers, and first Justinian or Tribonian defines matrimony a 'conjunction of man and woman containing individual accustom of life.' Wherein first, individual is not so bad as indissoluble put in by others: And altho' much cavil might be made in the distinguishing between indivisible and individual, yet the one taken for possible, the other for actual, neither the one nor the other can belong to the essence of marriage; especially when a civilian defines, by which law marriage is actually divorced for many causes, and with good leave, by mutual consent. Therefore where 'conjunction' is said, they who comment the Institutes, agree that conjunction of mind is by the law meant, not necessarily conjunction of body. That law then had good reason attending to its own definition, that divorce should be granted for the breaking of that conjunction which it holds necessary, sooner than for the want of that conjunction which it holds not necessary. And whereas Tuningus a famous lawyer excuses individual as the purpose of marriage, not always the success, it suffices not. Purpose is not able to constitute the essence of a thing. Nature herself, the universal mother, intends nothing but her own perfection and preservation; yet is not the more indissoluble for that. The Pandects out of Modestinus, though not define, yet well describe marriage, 'the conjunction of male and female, the society of all life, the communion of divine and human right:' which Bucer also imitates on the fifth to the Ephesians. But it seems rather to comprehend the several ends of marriage than to contain the more constituting cause that makes it what it is.

That I therefore among others (for who sings not Hylas?) may give as well as take matter to be judged on, it will be looked I should produce another definition than these which have not stood the trial. Thus then I suppose that marriage by the natural and plain order of God's institution in the text may be more demonstratively and essentially defined. 'Marriage is a divine institution, joining man and woman in a love fitly disposed to the helps and comforts of domestic life. A divine institution.' This contains the prime efficient cause of marriage: as for consent of parents and guardians, it seems rather a concurrence than a cause; for as many that marry are in their own power as not; and where they are not their own, yet are they not subjected beyond reason. Now though efficient causes are not requisite in a definition, yet divine institution hath such influence upon the Form, and is so a conserving cause of it, that without it the Form is not sufficient to distinguish matrimony from other conjunctions of male and female, which are not to be counted marriage. 'Joining man and woman in a love, &c.' This brings in the parties consent; until which be, the marriage hath no true being. When I say 'consent,' I mean not error, for error is not properly consent: And why should not consent be here understood with equity and good to either part, as in all other friendly covenants, and not be strained and cruelly urged to the mischief and destruction of both? Neither do I mean that singular act of consent which made the contract, for that may remain, and yet the marriage not true nor lawful; and that may cease, and yet the marriage both true and lawful, to their sin that break it. So that either as no efficient at all, or but a transitory, it comes not into the definition. That consent I mean which is a love fitly disposed to mutual help and comfort of life: this is that happy Form of Marriage naturally arising from the very heart of divine institution in the text, in all the former definitions either obscurely, and under mistaken terms ex-

prest, or not at all. This gives marriage all her due, all her benefits, all her being, all her distinct and proper being. This makes a marriage not a bondage, a blessing not a curse, a gift of God not a snare. Unless there be a love, and that love born of fitness, how can it last? unless it last, how can the best and sweetest purposes of marriage be attained? And they not attained, which are the chief ends, and with a lawful love constitute the formal cause itself of marriage, how can the essence thereof subsist? How can it be indeed what it goes for? Conclude therefore by all the power of reason, that where this essence of marriage is not, there can be no true marriage; and the parties either one of them or both, are free, and without fault, rather by a nullity than by a divorce, may betake them to a second choice, if their present condition be not tolerable to them. If any shall ask, why Domestic in the definition? I answer, that because both in the scriptures, and in the gravest poets and philosophers, I find the properties and excellencies of a wife set out only from domestic virtues; if they extend further, it diffuses them into the notion of some more common duty than matrimonial.

Thus far of the definition; the consecratory which flows from thence, altogether depends thereon, is manifestly brought in by this connexive particle 'Therefore;' and branches itself into a double consequence; First individual society, 'therefore shall a man leave father and mother:' Secondly, conjugal benevolence, 'and they shall be one flesh.' Which, as was shewn, is not without cause here mentioned, to prevent and to abolish the suspect of pollution in that natural and undefiled act. These consequences therefore cannot either in religion, law, or reason, be bound, and posted upon mankind to his sorrow and misery, but receive what force they have from the meetness of help and solace, which is the formal cause and end of that definition that sustains them. And although it be not for the majesty of scripture to humble herself in artificial Theorems, and Definitions, and Corollaries, like a professor in the schools, but looks to be analysed, and interpreted by the logical industry of her disciples and followers, and to be reduced by them as oft as need is, into those Sciential rules, which are the implements of instruction; yet Moses, as if foreseeing the miserable work that man's ignorance and pusillanimity would make in this matrimonious business, and endeavouring his utmost to prevent it, condescends in this place to such a methodical and school-like way of defining and consequencing, as in no place of the whole law more.

Thus we have seen, and if we be not contentious, may know what was marriage in the beginning, to which in the gospel we are referred; and what from hence to judge of nullity, or divorce. Here I esteem the work done; in this field the controversy decided; but because other places of Scripture seem to look averily upon this our decision, (although indeed they keep all harmony with it,) and because it is a better work to reconcile the seeming diversities of scripture, than the real dissensions of nearest friends; I shall assay in three following discourses to perform that Office.

Deut. xxiv. 1, 2.

1. 'When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her, then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house.'
2. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife.'

THAT which is the only discommodity of speaking in a clear matter, the abundance of argument that presses to be uttered, and the suspense of judgment what to choose, and how in the multitude of reason to be not tedious, is the greatest difficulty which I expect here to meet with. Yet much hath been said formerly concerning this law in 'the Doctrine of Divorce.' Whereof I shall repeat no more than what is necessary. Two things are here doubted: First, and that but of late, whether this be a law or no; next, what this reason of 'uncleanness' might mean, for which the law is granted. That

it is a plain law no man ever questioned, till Vatablus within these hundred years professed Hebrew at Paris, a man of no religion, as Beza decyphers him. Yet some there be who follow him, not only against the current of all antiquity both Jewish and Christian, but the evidence of scripture also, Malach. ii. 16. 'Let him who hateth put away, saith the Lord God of Israel.' Although this place also hath been tampered with, as if it were to be thus rendered, 'The Lord God saith, that he hateth putting away.' But this new interpretation rests only in the authority of Junius; for neither Calvin, nor Vatablus himself, nor any other known divine so interpreted before. And they of best note who have translated the scripture since, and Diodati for one, follow not his reading. And perhaps they might reject it, if for nothing else, for these two reasons: first, it introduces in a new manner the person of God speaking less majestic than he is ever wont: when God speaks by his prophet, he ever speaks in the first person, thereby signifying his majesty and omnipresence. He would have said, I hate putting away, saith the Lord; and not sent word by Malachi in a sudden fallen stile, 'The Lord God saith that he hateth putting away:' that were a phrase to shrink the glorious omnipresence of God speaking, into a kind of circumscriptive absence. And were as if a herald in the Atchievement of a king, should commit the indecorum to set his helmet sideways and close, not full-faced and open in the posture of direction and command. We cannot think therefore that this last prophet would thus in a new fashion absent the person of God from his own words, as if he came not along with them. For it would also be wide from the proper scope of this place: he that reads attentively will soon perceive, that God blames not here the Jews for putting away their wives, but for keeping strange concubines, to the 'profaning of Judah's holiness,' and the vexation of their Hebrew wives, v. 11, and 14. 'Judah hath married the daughter of a strange God:' And exhorts them rather to put their wives away whom they hate, as the law permitted, than to keep them under such affronts. And it is received that this prophet lived in those times of Ezra and Nehemiah (nay by some is thought to be Ezra himself) when the people were forced by these two worthies to put their strange wives away. So that what the story of those times, and the plain context of the eleventh verse, from whence this rebuke begins, can give us to conjecture of the obscure and curt Ebraisms that follow; this prophet does not forbid putting away, but forbids keeping, and commands putting away according to God's law, which is the plainest interpreter both of what God will, and what he can best suffer. Thus much evinces that God there commanded divorce by Malachi, and this confirms that he commands it also here by Moses.

I may the less doubt to mention by the way an author, though counted apocryphal, yet of no small account for piety and wisdom, the author of Ecclesiasticus. Which book, begun by the Grandfather of that Jesus who is called the Son of Sirach, might have been written in part, not much after the time when Malachi lived; if we compute by the reign of Ptolemæus Euergetes. It professes to explain the law and the prophets; and yet exhorts us to divorce for incurable causes, and to cut off from the flesh those whom it there describes, Ecclesiastic. xxv. 26. Which doubtless that wise and ancient writer would never have advised, had either Malachi so lately forbidden it, or the law by a full precept not left it lawful. But I urge not this for want of better proof; our Saviour himself allows divorce to be a command, Mark x. 3, 5. Neither do they weaken this assertion, who say it was only a sufferance, as shall be proved at large in that place of Mark. But suppose it were not a written law, they never can deny it was a custom, and so effect nothing. For the same reasons that induce them why it should not be a law, will straiten them as hard why it should be allowed a custom. All custom is either evil or not evil; if it be evil, this is the very end of lawgiving, to abolish evil customs by wholesome laws; unless we imagine Moses weaker than every negligent and startling politician. If it be, as they make this of divorce to be, a custom against nature, against justice, against charity, how, upon this most impure custom tolerated, could the God of
pureness.

pureness erect a nice and precise law, that the wife married after divorce could not return to her former husband, as being defiled? What was all this following niceness worth, built upon the lewd foundation of a wicked thing allowed? In few words then, this custom of divorce either was allowable or not allowable; if not allowable, how could it be allowed? if it were allowable, all who understand law will consent, that a tolerated custom hath the force of a law, and is indeed no other but an unwritten law, as Justinian calls it, and is as prevalent as any written statute. So that their shift of turning this law into a custom wheels about, and gives the onset upon their own flanks; not disproving, but concluding it to be the more firm law, because it was without controversy a granted custom; as clear in the reason of common life, as those given rules whereon Euclides builds his propositions.

Thus being every way a law of God, who can without blasphemy doubt it to be a just and pure law? Moses continually disavows the giving them any statute, or judgment, but what he learnt of God; of whom also in his song he saith, Deut. xxxii. 'He is the rock, his work is perfect, all his ways are judgment, a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he.' And David testifies, the judgments of the Lord 'are true and righteous altogether.' Not partly right and partly wrong, much less wrong altogether, as divines of now-a-days dare censure them. Moses again, of that people to whom he gave this law, saith, Deut. xiv. 'Ye are the children of the Lord your God, the Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people to himself above all the nations upon the earth, that thou shouldest keep all his commandments, and be high in praise, in name, and in honour, holy to the Lord!' chap. xxvi. And in the fourth, 'Behold I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me, keep therefore and do them. For this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of nations that shall hear all these statutes, and say, surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people. For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh to them? and what nation that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law which I set before you this day?' Thus whether we look at the purity and justice of God himself, the jealousy of his honour among other nations, the holiness and moral perfection which he intended by his law to teach this people, we cannot possibly think how he could indure to let them slug and grow inveterately wicked, under base allowances, and whole adulterous lives by dispensation. They might not eat, they might not touch an unclean thing; to what hypocrisy then were they trained up, if by prescription of the same law, they might be unjust, they might be adulterous for term of life? forbid to soil their garments with a coy imaginary pollution, but not forbid, but countenanced and animated by law to soil their souls with deepest defilements. What more unlike to God, what more like that God should hate, than that his law should be so curious to wash vessels, and vestures, and so careless to leave unwashed, unregarded, so foul a scab of Egypt in their souls? What would we more? The statutes of the Lord are all pure and just: and if all, then this of divorce.

'Because he hath found some uncleanness in her.'] That we may not esteem this law to be a mere authorizing of licence, as the Pharisees took it, Moses adds the reason, for 'some uncleanness found.' Some heretofore have been so ignorant, as to have thought, that this uncleanness means adultery. But Erasmus, who for having writ an excellent treatise of divorce, was wrote against by some burly standard divine perhaps of Cullen, or of Lovain, who calls himself Phimoistomus, shews learnedly out of the fathers, with other testimonies and reasons, that uncleanness is not here so understood; defends his former work, though new to that age, and perhaps counted licentious, and fears not to engage all his fame on the argument. Afterward, when expositors began to understand the Hebrew text, which they had not done of many ages before, they translated word for word not 'uncleanness,' but 'the nakedness of any thing;' and considering that nakedness is usually referred in Scripture to the mind as well as to the body, they constantly expound it any defect, annoyance, or ill quality in nature, which to be joined with,

with, makes life tedious, and such company worse than solitude. So that here will be no cause to vary from the general consent of exposition, which gives us freely that God permitted divorce, for whatever was unalterably distasteful, whether in body or mind. But with this admonishment, that if the Roman law, especially in contracts and dowries, left many things to equity with these cautions, 'ex fide bona, quod æquius melius erit, ut inter bonos bene agitur; we will not grudge to think that God intended not licence here to every humour, but to such remediless grievances as might move a good and honest and faithful man then to divorce, when it can no more be peace or comfort to either of them continuing thus joined. And although it could not be avoided, but that men of hard hearts would abuse this liberty, yet doubtless it was intended, as all other privileges in law are, to good men principally, to bad only by accident. So that the sin was not in the permission, nor simply in the action of divorce (for then the permitting also had been sin) but only in the abuse. But that this law should, as it were, be wrung from God and Moses, only to serve the hardheartedness, and the lust of injurious men, how remote it is from all sense, and law, and honesty, and therefore surely from the meaning of Christ, shall abundantly be manifest in due order.

Now although Moses needed not to add other reason of this law than that one there exprest, yet to these ages wherein canons, and Scotisms, and Lombard laws, have dulled, and almost obliterated the lively sculpture of ancient reason, and humanity; it will be requisite to heap reason upon reason, and all little enough to vindicate the whiteness and the innocence of this divine law, from the calumny it finds at this day, of being a door to licence and confusion. Whenas indeed there is not a judicial point in all Moses, consisting of more true equity, high wisdom, and godlike pity than this law; not derogating, but preserving the honour and peace of marriage, and exactly agreeing with the sense and mind of that institution in Genesis.

For first, if marriage be but an ordained relation, as it seems not more, it cannot take place above the prime dictates of nature: and if it be of natural right, yet it must yield to that which is more natural, and before it by eldership and precedence in nature. Now it is not natural that Hugh marries Beatrice, or Thomas Rebecca, being only a civil contract, and full of many chances; but that these men seek them meet helps, that only is natural, and that they espouse them such, that only is marriage. But if they find them neither fit helps nor tolerable society, what thing more natural, more original and first in nature than to depart from that which is irksome, grievous, actively hateful, and injurious even to hostility, especially in a conjugal respect, wherein antipathies are invincible, and where the forced abiding of the one can be no true good, no real comfort to the other? For if he find no contentment from the other, how can he return it from himself? or no acceptance, how can he mutually accept? What more equal, more pious than to untie a civil knot for a natural enmity held by violence from parting, to dissolve an accidental conjunction of this or that man and woman, for the most natural and most necessary disagreement of meet from unmeet, guilty from guiltless, contrary from contrary? It being certain that the mystical and blessed unity of marriage can be no way more unhallowed and profaned, than by the forcible uniting of such disunions and separations. Which if we see oft-times they cannot join or piece up to a common friendship, or to a willing conversation in the same house, how should they possibly agree to the most familiar and united amity of wedlock? Abraham and Lot, though dear friends and brethren in a strange country, chose rather to part asunder, than to infect their friendship with the strife of their servants: Paul and Barnabas, joined together by the Holy Ghost to a spiritual work, thought it better to separate when once they grew at variance. If these great saints, joined by nature, friendship, religion, high providence, and revelation, could not so govern a casual difference, a sudden passion, but must in wisdom divide from the outward duties of a friendship, or a colleagueship in the same family, or in the same journey, lest it should grow to a worse division; can any thing be more absurd
and

and barbarous, than that they whom only error, casualty, art, or plot, hath joined, should be compelled, not against a sudden passion, but against the permanent and radical discords of nature, to the most intimate and incorporating duties of love and imbracement, therein only rational and human, as they are free and voluntary; being else an abject and servile yoke, scarce not brutish? And that there is in man such a peculiar sway of liking or disliking in the affairs of matrimony, is evidently seen before marriage among those who can be friendly, can respect each other, yet to marry each other would not for any persuasion. If then this unfitness and disparity be not till after marriage discovered, through many causes, and colours, and concealments, that may overshadow; undoubtedly it will produce the same effects, and perhaps with more vehemence, that such a mistaken pair would give the world to be unmarried again. And their condition Solomon to the plain justification of divorce expresses, Prov. xxx. 21, 23. where he tells us of his own accord, that a 'hated, or a hateful woman, when she is married, is a thing for which the earth is disquieted, and cannot bear it:' Thus giving divine testimony to this divine law, which bids us nothing more than is the first and most innocent lesson of nature, to turn away peaceably from what afflicts, and hazards our destruction; especially when our staying can do no good, and is exposed to all evil.

Secondly, It is unjust that any ordinance, ordained to the good and comfort of man, where that end is missing, without his fault, should be forced upon him to an unsufferable misery and discomfort, if not commonly ruin. All ordinances are established in their end; the end of law is the virtue, is the righteousness of law: and therefore him we count an ill expounder, who urges law against the intention thereof. The general end of every ordinance, of every severest, every divinest, even of Sabbath, is the good of man; yea his temporal good not excluded. But marriage is one of the benignest ordinances of God to man, whereof both the general and particular end is the peace and contentment of man's mind, as the institution declares. Contentment of body they grant, which if it be defrauded, the plea of frigidity shall divorce: But here lies the fathomless absurdity, that granting this for bodily defect, they will not grant it for any defect of the mind, any violation of religious or civil society. Whenas, if the argument of Christ be firm against the ruler of the synagogue, Luke xiii. 'Thou hypocrite, doth not each of you on the Sabbath-day loosen his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him to watering, and should not I unbind a daughter of Abraham from this bond of Satan?' It stands as good here; ye have regard in marriage to the grievance of body, should you not regard more the grievances of the mind, seeing the soul as much excels the body, as the outward man excels the ass, and more? for that animal is yet a living creature, perfect in itself; but the body without the soul is a mere senseless trunk. No ordinance therefore given particularly to the good both spiritual and temporal of man, can be urged upon him to his mischief: and if they yield this to the unworthier part, the body, whereabout are they in their principles, that they yield it not to the more worthy, the mind of a good man?

Thirdly, As no ordinance, so no covenant, no not between God and man, much less between man and man, being, as all are, intended to the good of both parties, can hold to the deluding or making miserable of them both. For equity is understood in every covenant, even between enemies, tho' the terms be not expressed. If equity therefore made it, extremity may dissolve it. But marriage, they use to say, is the covenant of God. Undoubtedly: and so is any covenant frequently called in Scripture, wherein God is called to witness: The covenant of friendship between David and Jonathan, is called the Covenant of the Lord, 1 Sam. xx. The covenant of Zedekiah with the king of Babel, a covenant to be doubted whether lawful or no, yet in respect of God invoked thereto, is called 'the oath, and the covenant of God,' Ezek. xvii. Marriage also is called 'the Covenant of God,' Prov. ii. 17. Why, but as before, because God is the witness thereof, Mal. ii. 14. So that this denomination adds nothing to the covenant of marriage, above any

any other civil and solemn contract: nor is it more indissoluble for this reason than any other against the end of its own ordination; nor is any vow or oath to God exacted with such a rigour, where superstition reigns not. For look how much divine the covenant is, so much the more equal, so much the more to be expected that every article thereof should be fairly made good; no false dealing, or unperforming should be thrust upon men without redress, if the covenant be so divine. But faith, they say, must be kept in covenant, tho' to our damage. I answer, that only holds true, where the other side performs; which failing, he is no longer bound. Again, this is true, when the keeping of faith can be of any use or benefit to the other. But in marriage, a league of love and willingness, if faith be not willingly kept, it scarce is worth the keeping; nor can be any delight to a generous mind, with whom it is forcibly kept: and the question still supposes the one brought to an impossibility of keeping it as he ought, by the other's default; and to keep it formally, not only with a thousand shifts and dissimulations, but with open anguish, perpetual sadness and disturbance, no willingness, no cheerfulness, no contentment; cannot be any good to a mind not basely poor and shallow, with whom the contract of love is so kept. A covenant therefore brought to that pass, is on the unfaulty side without injury dissolved.

Fourthly, The law is not to neglect men under greatest sufferances, but to see covenants of greatest moment faithfulest performed. And what injury comparable to that sustained in a frustrate and false-dealing marriage, to lose, for another's fault against him, the best portion of his temporal comforts, and of his spiritual too, as it may fall out? It was the law, that for man's good and quiet, reduced things to propriety, which were at first in common; how much more law-like were it to assist nature in disappropriating that evil which by continuing proper becomes destructive? But he might have bewared. So he might in any other covenant, wherein the law does not constrain error to so dear a forfeit. And yet in these matters wherein the wisest are apt to err, all the wariness that can be, oft-times nothing avails. But the law can compel the offending party to be more duteous. Yes, if all these kind of offences were fit in public to be complained of, or being compelled were any satisfaction to a mate not sottish, or malicious. And these injuries work so vehemently, that if the law remedy them not, by separating the cause when no way else will pacify, the person not relieved betakes him either to such disorderly courses, or to such a dull dejection as renders him either infamous, or useless to the service of God and his country. Which the law ought to prevent as a thing pernicious to the commonwealth; and what better prevention than this which Moses used?

Fifthly, The law is to tender the liberty and the human dignity of them that live under the law, whether it be the man's right above the woman, or the woman's just appeal against wrong and servitude. But the duties of marriage contain in them a duty of benevolence, which to do by compulsion against the soul, where there can be neither peace, nor joy, nor love, but an enthrallment to one who either cannot, or will not be mutual in the godliest and the civilest ends of that society, is the ignoblest, and the lowest slavery that a human shape can be put to. This law therefore justly and piously provides against such an unmanly task of bondage as this. The civil law, tho' it favoured the setting free of a slave, yet if he proved ungrateful to his patron, reduced him to a servile condition. If that law did well to reduce from liberty to bondage for an ingratitude not the greatest, much more became it the law of God to enact the restorement of a free-born man from an unpurposed, and unworthy bondage, to a rightful liberty, for the most unnatural fraud and ingratitude that can be committed against him. And if that civilian emperor in his title of 'Donations,' permit the giver to recall his gift from him who proves unthankful towards him; yea, tho' he had subscribed and signed in the deed of his gift, not to recall it, though for this very cause of ingratitude; with much more equity doth Moses permit here the giver to recall no petty gift, but the gift of himself from one who most

injuriously and deceitfully uses him against the main ends and conditions of his giving himself, expressed in God's institution.

Sixthly, Altho' there be nothing in the plain words of this law, that seems to regard the afflictions of a wife, how great soever; yet expositors determine, and doubtless determine rightly, that God was not uncompassionate of them also in the framing of this law. For should the rescript of Antoninus in the civil law give release to servants flying for refuge to the emperor's statue, by giving leave to change their cruel masters; and should God, who in his law also is good to injured servants, by granting them their freedom in divers cases, not consider the wrongs and miseries of a wife, which is no servant? Tho' herein the counter-sense of our divines, to me, I must confess seems admirable; who teach that God gave this as a merciful law, not for man whom he here names, and to whom by name he gives this power; but for the wife, whom he names not, and to whom by name he gives no power at all. For certainly if man be liable to injuries in marriage, as well as woman, and man be the worthier person, it were a preposterous law to respect only the less worthy; her whom God made for marriage, and not him at all for whom marriage was made.

Seventhly, The law of marriage gives place to the power of parents: for we hold, that consent of parents not had, may break the wedlock, tho' else accomplished. It gives place to masterly power, for the master might take away from an Hebrew servant the wife which he gave him, Exod. xxi. If it be answered, that the marriage of servants is no matrimony: it is replied, that this in the ancient Roman law is true, not in the Mosaic. If it be added, she was a stranger, not an Hebrew, therefore easily divorced; it will be answered, that strangers not being Canaanites, and they also being converts, might be lawfully married, as Rahab was. And her conversion is here supposed; for an Hebrew master could not lawfully give an Heathen wife to an Hebrew servant. However, the divorcing of an Israelitish woman was as easy by the law, as the divorcing of a stranger, and almost in the same words permitted, Deut. xxiv. and Deut. xxi. Lastly it gives place to the right of war, for a captive woman lawfully married, and afterwards not beloved, might be dismissed, only without ransom, Deut. xxi. If marriage be dissolved by so many exterior powers, not superior, as we think, why may not the power of marriage itself, for its own peace and honour, dissolve itself, where the persons wedded be free persons? Why may not a greater and more natural power complaining dissolve marriage? For the ends why matrimony was ordained, are certainly and by all logic above the ordinance itself; why may not that dissolve marriage, without which that institution hath no force at all? For the prime ends of marriage, are the whole strength and validity thereof, without which matrimony is like an idol, nothing in the world. But those former allowances were all for hardness of heart. Be that granted, until we come where to understand it better: if the law suffer thus far the obstinacy of a bad man, is it not more righteous here, to do willingly what is but equal, to remove in season the extremities of a good man?

Eighthly, If a man had deflowered a virgin, or brought an ill name on his wife that she came not a virgin to him, he was amerced in certain shekels of silver, and bound never to divorce her all his days, Deut. xxii. which shews that the law gave no liberty to divorce, where the injury was palpable; and that the absolute forbidding to divorce, was in part the punishment of a deflowerer, and a defamer. Yet not so but that the wife questionless might depart when she pleased. Otherwise this course had not so much righted her, as delivered her up to more spight and cruel usage. This law therefore doth justly distinguish the privilege of an honest and blameless man in the matter of divorce, from the punishment of a notorious offender.

Ninthly, Suppose it should be imputed to a man that he was too rash in his choice, and why he took not better heed, let him now smart, and bear his folly as he may; altho' the law of God, that terrible law, do not thus upbraid the infirmities and unwilling mistake

mistakes of man in his integrity : but suppose these and the like proud aggravations of some stern hypocrite, more merciless in his mercies, than any literal law in the rigour of severity, must be patiently heard ; yet all law, and God's law especially grants everywhere to error easy remittments, even where the utmost penalty exacted were no undoing. With great reason therefore and mercy doth it here not torment an error, if it be so, with the indurance of a whole life lost to all household comfort and society, a punishment of too vast and huge dimension for an error, and the more unreasonable for that the like objection may be opposed against the plea of divorcing for adultery : he might have looked better before to her breeding under religious parents : why did he not more diligently inquire into her manners, into what company she kept ? every glance of her eye, every step of her gait would have prophesied adultery, if the quick scent of these discerners had been took along ; they had the divination to have foretold you all this, as they have now the divinity to punish an error inhumanly. As good reason to be content, and forced to be content with your adultress ; if these objecters might be the judges of human frailty. But God, more mild and good to man, than man to his brother, in all this liberty given to divorcement, mentions not a word of our past errors and mistakes, if any were ; which these men objecting from their own inventions, prosecute with all violence and iniquity. For if the one be to look so narrowly what he takes, at the peril of ever keeping, why should not the other be made as wary what is promised, by the peril of losing ? for without those promises the treaty of marriage had not proceeded. Why should his own error bind him, rather than the other's fraud acquit him ? Let the buyer beware, saith the old law-beaten termier. Belike then there is no more honesty, nor ingenuity in the bargain of a wedlock, than in the buying of a colt : we must it seems drive it on as craftily with those whose affinity we seek, as if they were a pack of false-men and complotters. But the deceiver deceives himself in the unprosperous marriage, and therein is sufficiently punished. I answer, that the most of those who deceive, are such as either understand not, or value not the true purposes of marriage ; they have the prey they seek, not the punishment : yet say it prove to them some cross, it is not equal that error and fraud should be linked in the same degree of forfeiture, but rather that error should be acquitted, and fraud bereaved his morsel, if the mistake were not on both sides ; for then on both sides the acquitment will be reasonable, if the bondage be intolerable ; which this law graciously determines, not unmindful of the wife, as was granted willingly to the common expositors, though beyond the letter of this law, yet not beyond the spirit of charity.

Tenthly, marriage is a solemn thing, some say a holy, the resemblance of Christ and his church : and so indeed it is where the persons are truly religious ; and we know all sacred things not performed sincerely as they ought, are no way acceptable to God in their outward formality. And that wherein it differs from personal duties, if they be not truly done, the fault is in ourselves ; but marriage to be a true and pious marriage is not in the single power of any person ; the essence whereof as of all other covenants, is in relation to another, the making and maintaining causes thereof are all mutual, and must be a communion of spiritual and temporal comforts. If then either of them cannot, or obstinately will not be answerable in these duties, so as that the other can have no peaceful living, or endure the want of what he justly seeks, and sees no hope, then strait from that dwelling, love, which is the soul of wedlock, takes his flight, leaving only some cold performances of civil and common respects ; but the true bond of marriage, if there were ever any there, is already burst like a rotten thread. Then follows dissimulation, suspicion, false colours, false pretences, and worse than these, disturbance, annoyance, vexation, sorrow, temptation even in the faultless person, weary of himself, and of all actions public or domestic ; then comes disorder, neglect, hatred, and perpetual strife, all these the enemies of holiness and christianity, and every one persisted in, a remediless violation of matrimony. Therefore God who hates all feigning and formality,

lity, where there should be all faith and sincereness, and abhors the inevitable discord, where there should be greater concord; when through another's default, faith and concord cannot be, counts it neither just to punish the innocent with the transgressor, nor holy, nor honourable for the sanctity of marriage, that should be the union of peace and love to be made the commitment, and close fight of enmity and hate. And therefore doth in this law, what best agrees with his goodness, loosening a sacred thing to peace and charity, rather than binding it to hatred and contention; loosening only the outward and formal tie of that which is already inwardly and really broken, or else was really never joined.

Eleventhly, one of the chief matrimonial ends is said to seek a holy seed; but where an unfit marriage administers continual cause of hatred and distemper, there, as was heard before, cannot choose but much unholiness abide. Nothing more unhallows a man, more unprepares him to the service of God in any duty, than a habit of wrath and perturbation, arising from the importunity of troublous causes never absent. And where the household stands in this plight, what love can there be to the unfortunate issue, what care of their breeding, which is of main conducement to their being holy? God therefore knowing how unhappy it would be for children to be born in such a family, gives this law as a prevention, that being an unhappy pair, they should not add to be unhappy parents, or else as a remedy that if there be children, while they are fewest, they may follow either parent, as shall be agreed, or judged, from the house of hatred and discord to a place of more holy and peaceable education.

Twelfthly, All law is available to some good end, but the final prohibition of divorce avails to no good end, causing only the endless aggravation of evil, and therefore this permission of divorce was given to the Jews by the wisdom and fatherly providence of God; who knew that law cannot command love, without which matrimony hath no true being, no good, no solace, nothing of God's instituting, nothing but so sordid and so low, as to be disdained of any generous person. Law cannot enable natural inability either of body, or mind, which gives the grievance; it cannot make equal those inequalities, it cannot make fit those unfitnesses; and where there is malice more than defect of nature, it cannot hinder ten thousand injuries, and bitter actions of despight, too subtle and too unapparent for law to deal with. And while it seeks to remedy more outward wrongs, it exposes the injured person to other more inward and more cutting. All these evils unavoidably will redound upon the children, if any be, and upon the whole family. It degenerates and disorders the best spirits, leaves them to unsettled imaginations, and degraded hopes, careless of themselves, their households and their friends, unactive to all public service, dead to the commonwealth; wherein they are by one mishap, and no willing trespass of theirs, outlawed from all the benefits and comforts of married life and posterity. It confers as little to the honour and inviolable keeping of matrimony, but sooner stirs up temptations and occasions to secret adulteries and unchaste roving. But it maintains public honesty. Public folly rather; who shall judge of public honesty? The law of God and of ancientest Christians, and all civil nations, or the illegitimate law of monks and canonists, the most malevolent, most unexperienced, most incompetent judges of matrimony?

These reasons, and many more that might be alledged, afford us plainly to perceive, both what good cause this law had to do for good men in mischances, and what necessity it had to suffer accidentally the hard-heartedness of bad men, which it could not certainly discover, or discovering, could not subdue, no nor endeavour to restrain without multiplying sorrow to them, for whom all was endeavoured. The guiltless therefore were not deprived their needful redresses, and the hard hearts of others unchastiseable in those judicial courts, were so remitted there, as bound over to the higher session of conscience.

Notwithstanding all this, there is a loud exception against this law of God, nor can the holy author save his law from this exception, that it opens a door to all licence and confusion.

confusion. But this is the rudest, I was almost saying the most graceless objection, and with the least reverence to God and Moses, that could be devised: This is to cite God before man's tribunal, to arrogate a wisdom and holiness above him. Did not God then foresee what event of licence or confusion could follow? Did not he know how to ponder these abuses with more prevailing respects, in the most even balance of his justice and pureness, till these correctors came up to shew him better? The law is, if it stir up sin any way, to stir it up by forbidding, as one contrary excites another, Rom. vii. but if it once come to provoke sin, by granting licence to sin, according to laws that have no other honest end, but only to permit the fulfilling of obstinate lust, how is God not made the contradicter of himself? No man denies that best things may be abused: but it is a rule resulting from many pregnant experiences, that what doth most harm in the abusing, used rightly doth most good. And such a good to take away from honest men, for being abused by such as abuse all things, is the greatest abuse of all. That the whole law is no further useful, than as a man uses it lawfully, St. Paul teaches 1 Tim. i. And that christian liberty may be used for an occasion to the flesh, the same apostle confesses, Gal. v. yet thinks not of removing it for that, but bids us rather 'stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath freed us, and not be held again in the yoke of bondage.' The very permission which Christ gave to divorce for adultery, may be foully abused, by any whose hardness of heart can either feign adultery, or dares commit, that he may divorce. And for this cause the pope, and hitherto the church of England, forbid all divorce from the bond of marriage, though for openest adultery. If then it be righteous to hinder for the fear of abuse, that which God's law, notwithstanding that caution, hath warranted to be done, doth not our righteousness come short of antichrist? or do we not rather herein conform ourselves to his unrighteousness in this undue and unwise fear? For God regards more to relieve by this law the just complaints of good men, than to curb the licence of wicked men, to the crushing withal, and the overwhelming of his afflicted servants. He loves more that his law should look with pity upon the difficulties of his own, than with rigour upon the boundless riots of them who serve another master, and hindered here by strictness, will break another way to worse enormities. If this law therefore have many good reasons for which God gave it, and no intention of giving scope to lewdness, but as abuse by accident comes in with every good law, and every good thing; it cannot be wisdom in us, while we can content us with God's wisdom, nor can be purity, if his purity will suffice us, to except against this law, as if it fostered licence. But if they affirm this law had no other end, but to permit obdurate lust, because it would be obdurate, making the law of God intentionally to proclaim and enact sin lawful, as if the will of God were become sinful, or sin stronger than his direct and law-giving will; the men would be admonished to look well to it, that while they are so eager to shut the door against licence, they do not open a worse door to blasphemy. And yet they shall be here further shewn their iniquity: what more foul common sin among us than drunkenness? And who can be ignorant, that if the importation of wine, and the use of all strong drink, were forbid, it would both clean rid the possibility of committing that odious vice, and men might afterwards live happily and healthfully without the use of those intoxicating liquors. Yet who is there the severest of them all, that ever propounded to lose his sack, his ale, toward the certain abolishing of so great a sin? who is there of them, the holiest, that less loves his rich canary at meals, though it be fetched from places that hazard the religion of them who fetch it, and though it make his neighbour drunk out of the same tun? While they forbid not therefore the use of that liquid merchandize, which forbidden would utterly remove a most loathsome sin, and not impair either the health or the refreshment of mankind, supplied many other ways; why do they forbid a law of God, the forbidding whereof brings into excessive bondage oftentimes the best of men, and betters not the worse? He to remove a national vice, will not pardon his cups, nor think

it concerns him to forbear the quaffing of that outlandish grape, in his unnecessary fulness, tho' other men abuse it never so much; nor is he so abstemious as to intercede with the magistrate that all matter of drunkenness be banished the commonwealth; and yet for the fear of a less inconvenience unpardonably requires of his brethren, in their extreme necessity, to debar themselves the use of God's permissive law, though it might be their saving, and no man's endangering the more. Thus this peremptory strictness we may discern of what sort it is, how unequal, and how unjust.

But it will breed confusion. What confusion it would breed, God himself took the care to prevent in the fourth verse of this chapter, that the divorced being married to another, might not return to her former husband. And Justinian's law counsels the same in his title of 'nuptials.' And what confusion else can there be in separation, to separate upon extreme urgency, the religious from the irreligious, the fit from the unfit, the willing from the wilful, the abused from the abuser? Such a separation is quite contrary to confusion. But to bind and mix together holy with atheist, heavenly with hellish, fitness with unfitness, light with darkness, antipathy with antipathy, the injured with the injurer, and force them into the most inward nearness of a detested union; this doubtless is the most horrid, the most unnatural mixture, the greatest confusion that can be confused.

Thus by this plain and Christian Talmud, vindicating the law of God from irreverent and unwary expositions, I trust, where it shall meet with intelligible perusers, some stay at least of men's thoughts will be obtained, to consider these many prudent and righteous ends of this divorcing permission: That it may have, for the great author's sake, hereafter some competent allowance to be counted a little purer than the prerogative of a legal and public ribaldry, granted to that holy seed. So that from hence, we shall hope to find the way still more open to the reconciling of those places which treat this matter in the gospel. And thither now without interruption the course of method brings us.

T E T R A C H O R D O N :

MATTH. V. 31, 32.

31. "It hath been said, whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement."

32. "But I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away his wife," &c.

MATTH. XIX. 3, 4, &c.

3. "And the Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him," &c.

"IT hath been said."] What hitherto hath been spoke upon the law of God touching matrimony or divorce, he who will deny to have been argued according to reason and all equity of Scripture, I cannot edify how, or by what rule of proportion that man's virtue calculates, what his elements are, nor what his analytics. Confidently to those who have read good books, and to those whose reason is not an illiterate book to themselves, I appeal, whether they would not confess all this to be the commentary of truth and justice, were it not for these recited words of our Saviour. And if they take not back that which they thus grant, nothing sooner might persuade them that Christ here teaches no new precept, and nothing sooner might direct them to find his meaning, than to compare and measure it by the rules of nature and eternal righteousness, which no written law extinguishes, and the gospel least of all. For what can be more opposite and disparaging to the covenant of love, of freedom, and of our manhood in grace, than to be made the yoking pedagogue of new severities, the scribe of syllables and rigid letters, not only grievous to the best of men, but different and strange from the light of reason in them, save only as they are fain to stretch and distort their apprehensions, for fear of displeasing the verbal straitness of a text, which our own servile fear gives us not the leisure to understand aright? If the law of Christ shall be written in our hearts, as was promised to the gospel, Jer. xxxi. how can this in the vulgar and superficial sense be a law of Christ, so far from being written in our hearts, that it injures and disallows not only the free dictates of nature and moral law, but of charity also and religion in our hearts? Our Saviour's doctrine is, that the end, and the fulfilling of every command is charity; no faith without it, no truth without it, no worship, no works pleasing to God but as they partake of charity. He himself sets us an example, breaking the solemnest and strictest ordinance of religious rest, and justified the breaking, not to cure a dying man, but such whose cure might without danger have been deferred. And wherefore needs must the sick man's bed be carried on that day by his appointment? And why were the disciples, who could not forbear on that day to pluck the corn, so industriously defended, but to shew us that if he preferred the slightest occasions of man's good before the observing of highest and severest ordinances, he gave us much more easy leave to break the intolerable yoke of a never well-joined wedlock for the removing of our heaviest afflictions? Therefore it is that the most of evangelic precepts are given us in proverbial forms, to drive us from the letter, tho' we love ever to be sticking there. For no other cause did Christ assure us that whatsoever things we bind, or slacken on earth, are so in heaven, but to signify that the christian arbitrement of charity is supreme decider of all controversy, and supreme resolver of all Scripture; not as the Pope determines for his own tyranny, but as the church ought to determine for its own true liberty. Hence Eusebius, not far from the beginning of his history, compares the state of christians to that of Noah and the patriarchs before the law. And this indeed was the reason why Apostolic tradition in the ancient Church was counted nigh equal to the written word, tho' it carried them at length awry, for want of considering that tradition was not left to
be

be imposed as law, but to be a pattern of that christian prudence, and liberty which holy men by right assumed of old; which truth was so evident, that it found entrance even into the council of Trent, when the point of tradition came to be discussed. And Marinaro, a learned Carmelite, for approaching too near the true cause that gave esteem to tradition, that is to say, the difference between the Old and New Testament, the one punctually prescribing written law, the other guiding by the inward spirit, was reprehended by cardinal Pool as one that had spoken more worthy a German Colloquy, than a general council. I omit many instances, many proofs and arguments of this kind, which alone would compile a just volume, and shall content me here to have shewn briefly that the great and almost only commandment of the gospel, is to command nothing against the good of man, and much more no civil command against his civil good. If we understand not this, we are but cracked cimbals, we do but tinkle, we know nothing, we do nothing, all the sweat of our toilsomest obedience will but mock us. And what we suffer superstitiously, returns us no thanks. Thus medecining our eyes, we need not doubt to see more into the meaning of these our Saviour's words, than many who have gone before us.

"It hath been said, whosoever shall put away his wife." Our Saviour was by the doctors of his time suspected of intending to dissolve the law. In this chapter he wipes off this aspersion upon his accusers, and shews, how they were the law-breakers. In every commonwealth, when it decays, corruption makes two main steps; first, when men cease to do according to the inward and uncompelled actions of virtue, caring only to live by the outward constraint of law, and turn the simplicity of real good into the craft of seeming so by law. To this hypocritical honesty was Rome declined in that age wherein Horace lived, and discovered it to Quintius.

Whom do we count a good man, whom but he
Who keeps the laws and statutes of the Senate?
Who judges in great suits and controversies,
Whose witness and opinion wins the cause?
But his own house, and the whole neighbourhood
Sees his foul inside through his whited skin.

The next declining is, when law becomes now too strait for the secular manners, and those too loose for the cincture of law. This brings in false and crooked interpretations to eke out law, and invents the futtle encroachment of obscure traditions hard to be disproved. To both these descents the Pharisees themselves were fallen. Our Saviour therefore shews them both where they broke the law, in not marking the divine intent thereof, but only the letter; and where they depraved the letter also with sophistical expositions. This law of divorce they had depraved both ways: first, by teaching that to give a bill of divorce was all the duty which that law required, whatever the cause were; next by running to divorce for any trivial, accidental cause; whenas the law evidently stays in the grave causes of natural and immutable dislike. "It hath been said, saith he. Christ doth not put any contempt or disesteem upon the law of Moses, by citing it so briefly; for in the same manner God himself cites a law of greatest caution, Jer. iii. "They say if a man put away his wife, shall he return to her again?" &c. Nor doth he more abolish it than the law of swearing, cited next with the same brevity, and more appearance of contradicting: for divorce hath an exception left it; but we are charged there, as absolutely as words can charge us, "not to swear at all:" yet who denies the lawfulness of an oath, tho' here it be in no case permitted? And what shall become of his solemn protestation not to abolish one law, or one tittle of any law, especially of those which he mentions in this chapter? And that he meant more particularly the not abolishing of Mosaic divorce, is beyond all cavil manifest in Luke xvi. 17, 18. where this clause against abrogating is inserted immediately before the sentence against divorce, as if it were called thither on purpose

purpose to defend the equity of this particular law against the foreseen rashness of common textuaries, who abolish laws, as the rabble demolish images, in the zeal of their hammers oft violating the sepulchres of good men: like Pentheus in the tragedies, they see that for Thebes which is not, and take that for superstition, as these men in the heat of their annulling perceive not how they abolish right, and equal, and justice, under the appearance of judicial. And yet are confessing all the while, that these sayings of Christ stand not in contradiction to the law of Moses, but to the false doctrine of the Pharisees raised from thence; that the law of God is perfect, not liable to additions or diminutions: and Paræus accuses the Jesuit Maldonatus of greatest falsity for limiting the perfection of that law only to the rudeness of the Jews. He adds, "That the law promiseth life to the performers thereof, therefore needs not perfecter precepts than such as bring to life; that if the corrections of Christ stand opposite, not to the corruptions of the Pharisees, but to the law itself of God, the heresy of Manes would follow, one God of the Old Testament, and another of the New. That Christ saith not here, except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of Moses law, but of the Scribes and Pharisees." That all this may be true: whither is common sense flown askint, if we can maintain that Christ forbid the Mosaic divorce utterly, and yet abolished not the law that permits it? For if the conscience only were checked, and the law not repealed, what means the Fanatic boldness of this age, that dares tutor Christ to be more strict than he thought fit? Ye shall have the evasion, it was a judicial law. What could infancy and slumber have invented more childish? Judicial or not judicial, it was one of those laws expressly which he forewarned us with protestation, that his mind was, not to abrogate: and if we mark the steerage of his words, what course they hold, we may perceive that what he protested not to dissolve (that he might faithfully and not deceitfully remove a suspicion from himself) was principally concerning the judicial law; for of that sort are all these here which he vindicates, except the last. Of the ceremonial law he told them true, that nothing of it should pass "until all were fulfilled." Of the moral law he knew the Pharisees did not suspect he meant to nullify that: for so doing would soon have undone his authority, and advanced theirs. Of the judicial law therefore chiefly this apology was meant: For how is that fulfilled longer than the common equity thereof remains in force? And how is this our Saviour's defence of himself not made fallacious, if the Pharisees chief fear be lest he should abolish the judicial law, and he to satisfy them, protests his good intention to the moral law? It is the general grant of divines that what in the judicial law is not merely judaical*, but reaches to human equity in common, was never in the thought of being abrogated. If our Saviour took away aught of law, it was the burthensome of it, not the ease of burden; it was the bondage, not the liberty of any divine law, that he removed: this he often professed to be the end of his coming. But what if the law of divorce be a moral law, as most certainly it is fundamentally, and hath been so proved in the reasons thereof? For tho' the giving of a bill may be judicial, yet the act of divorce is altogether conversant in good and evil, and so absolutely moral. So far as it is good, it never can be abolished, being moral; and so far as it is simply evil, it never could be judicial, as hath been shewn at large "in the doctrine of divorce," and will be reassumed anon. Whence one of these two necessities follow, that either it was never established, or never abolished. Thus much may be enough to have said on this place. The following verse will be better unfolded in the xix. chapter, where it meets us again, after a large debatement on the question between our Saviour and his adversaries.

* The first edition has *judicial*, but as that word may not be so universally understood in this place, as *judaical*, (tho' the meaning of both be here the same) we have therefore inserted the latter word in the text.

Matt. XIX. 3, 4, &c.

Ver. 3. "And the pharisees came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him."

"**T**empting him." The manner of these men coming to our Saviour, not to learn, but to tempt him, may give us to expect that their answer will be such as is fittest for them; not so much a teaching, as an intangling. No man, though never so willing or so well enabled to instruct, but if he discern his willingness and candor made use of to intrap him, will suddenly draw in himself, and laying aside the facil vein of perspicuity, will know his time to utter clouds and riddles; if he be not less wise than that noted fish, whenas he should be not unwiser than the serpent. Our Saviour at no time expressed any great desire, to teach the obstinate and unteachable pharisees; but when they came to tempt him, then least of all. As now about the liberty of divorce, so another time about the punishment of adultery, they came to found him; and what satisfaction got they from his answer, either to themselves, or to us, that might direct a law under the Gospel, new from that of Moses, unless we draw his absolution of adultery into an edict? So about the tribute, who is there can pick out a full solution, what and when we must give to Cæsar, by the answer which he gave the pharisees? If we must give to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, and all be Cæsar's which hath his image, we must either new stamp our coin, or we may go new stamp our foreheads with the superscription of slaves instead of freemen. Besides, it is a general precept not only of Christ, but of all other sages, not to instruct the unworthy and the conceited, who love tradition more than truth, but to perplex and stumble them purposely with contrived obscurities. No wonder then if they who would determine of divorce by this place, have ever found it difficult, and unsatisfying through all the ages of the church, as Austin himself and other great writers confess. Lastly, it is manifest to be the principal scope of our Saviour, both here, and in the fifth of Matthew, to convince the pharisees of what they being evil did licentiously, not to explain what others being good and blameless men might be permitted to do in case of extremity. Neither was it seasonable to talk of honest and conscientious liberty among them, who had abused legal and civil liberty to uncivil licence. We do not say to a servant what we say to a son; nor was it expedient to preach freedom to those who had transgressed in wantonness. When we rebuke a prodigal, we admonish him of thrift, not of magnificence, or bounty. And to school a proud man, we labour to make him humble, not magnanimous. So Christ to retort these arrogant inquisitors their own, took the course to lay their haughtiness under a severity which they deserved; not to acquaint them, or to make them judges either of the just man's right and privilege, or of the afflicted man's necessity. And if we may have leave to conjecture, there is a likelihood offered us by Tertullian in his fourth against Marcion, whereby it may seem very probable that the pharisees had a private drift of malice against our Saviour's life in proposing this question; and our Saviour had a peculiar aim in the rigour of his answer, both to let them know the freedom of his spirit, and the sharpness of his discerning. "This I must now shew," saith Tertullian, "whence our Lord deduced this sentence, and which way he directed it, whereby it will more fully appear that he intended not to dissolve Moses." And thereupon tells us, that the vehemence of this our Saviour's speech was chiefly darted against Herod and Herodias. The story is out of Josephus; Herod had been a long time married to the daughter of Aretas king of Petra, till happening on his journey towards Rome to be entertained at his brother Philip's house, he cast his eye unlawfully and unguestlike upon Herodias there, the wife of Philip, but daughter to Aristobulus their common brother, and durst make words of marrying her his niece from his brother's bed. She assented, upon agreement he should expel his former wife. All was accomplished, and by the Baptist rebuked with the loss of his head. Though doubtless that stayed not the various discourses of men upon the fact, which while the Herodian flatterers, and not a few perhaps among

among the pharisees, endeavoured to defend by wresting the law, it might be a means to bring the question of divorce into a hot agitation among the people, how far Moses gave allowance. The pharisees therefore knowing our Saviour to be a friend of John the Baptist, and no doubt but having heard much of his sermon on the mount, wherein he spake rigidly against the licence of divorce, they put him this question, both in hope to find him a contradicter of Moses, and a condemner of Herod; so to insnare him within compass of the same accusation which had ended his friend; and our Saviour so orders his answer, as that they might perceive Herod and his adulterers, only not named: so lively it concerned them both what he spake. No wonder then if the sentence of our Saviour sounded stricter than his custom was; which his conscious attempters doubtless apprehended sooner than his other auditors. Thus much we gain from hence to inform us, that what Christ intends to speak here of divorce, will be rather the forbidding of what we may not do herein passionately and abusively, as Herod and Herodias did, than the discussing of what herein we may do reasonably and necessarily.

“Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?”] It might be rendered more exactly from the Greek, “to loosen or to set free;” which tho’ it seem to have a milder signification than the two Hebrew words commonly used for divorce, yet interpreters have noted, that the Greek also is read in the Septuagint, for an act which is not without constraint. As when Achish drove from his presence David, counterfeiting madness. Psal. xxxiv. the Greek word is the same with this here, to put away. And Erasmus quotes Hilary rendering it by an expression not so soft. Whence may be doubted, whether the pharisees did not state this question in the strict right of the man, not tarrying for the wife’s consent. And if our Saviour answered directly according to what was asked in the term of putting away, it will be questionable, whether the rigour of his sentence did not forbid only such putting away as is without mutual consent, in a violent and harsh manner, or without any reason but will, as the Tetrarch did. Which might be the cause that those christian emperors feared not in their constitutions to dissolve marriage by mutual consent; in that our Saviour seems here, as the case is most likely, not to condemn all divorce, but all injury and violence in divorce. But no injury can be done to them, who seek it, as the Ethics of Aristotle sufficiently prove. True it is, that an unjust thing may be done to one tho’ willing, and so may justly be forbidden: but divorce being in itself no unjust or evil thing, but only as it is joined with injury or lust; injury it cannot be at law, if consent be, and Aristotle err not. And lust it may as frequently not be, while charity hath the judging of so many private grievances in a misfortuned wedlock, which may pardonably seek a redemption. But whether it be or not, the law cannot discern, or examine lust, so long as it walks from one lawful term to another, from divorce to marriage, both in themselves indifferent. For if the law cannot take hold to punish many actions apparently covetous, ambitious, ingrateful, proud, how can it forbid and punish that for lust, which is but only surmised so, and can no more be certainly proved in the divorcing now, than before in the marrying? Whence if divorce be no unjust thing, but through lust, a cause not discernable by law, as law is wont to discern in other cases, and can be no injury, where consent is; there can be nothing in the equity of law, why divorce by consent may not be lawful: leaving secrecies to conscience, the thing which our Saviour here aims to rectify, not to revoke the statutes of Moses. In the mean while the word “to put away,” being in the Greek to loosen or dissolve, utterly takes away that vain papistical distinction of divorce from bed, and divorce from bond, evincing plainly, that Christ and the pharisees mean here that divorce which finally dissolves the bond, and frees both parties to a second marriage.

“For every cause.”] This the pharisees held, that for every cause they might divorce, for every accidental cause, any quarrel or difference that might happen. So both Josephus and Philo, men who lived in the same age, explain; and the Syriac translator, whose antiquity is thought parallel to the Evangelists themselves, reads it conformably, “upon

any occasion or pretence." Divines also generally agree that thus the pharisees meant. Cameron, a late writer, much applauded, commenting this place not undiligently, affirms that the Greek preposition *κατά* translated unusually (for) hath a force in it implying the suddenness of those pharisaic divorces; and that their question was to this effect, "whether for any cause whatever it chanced to be, straight as it rose, the divorce might be lawful." This he freely gives, whatever moved him, and I as freely take, nor can deny his observation to be acute and learned. If therefore we insist upon the word of "putting away;" that it imports a constraint without consent, as might be insisted, and may enjoy what Cameron bestows on us, that "for every cause" is to be understood, "according as any cause may happen," with a relation to the speediness of those divorces, and that Herodian act especially, as is already brought us; the sentence of our Saviour will appear nothing so strict a prohibition as hath been long conceived, forbidding only to divorce for casual and temporary causes, that may be soon ended, or soon remedied: and likewise forbidding to divorce rashly, and on the sudden heat, except it be for adultery. If these qualifications may be admitted, as partly we offer them, partly are offered them by some of their own opinion, and that where nothing is repugnant why they should not be admitted, nothing can wrest them from us; the severe sentence of our Saviour will straight unbend the seeming frown into that gentleness and compassion which was so abundant in all his actions, his office and his doctrine, from all which otherwise it stands off at no mean distance.

Ver. 4. "And he answered and said unto them, have ye not read that he which made them at the beginning, made them male and female?"

Ver. 5. "And said, for this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh."

Ver. 6. "Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh: what therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."

4, and 5. "Made them male and female; and said, for this cause, &c." We see it here undeniably, that the law which our Saviour cites to prove that divorce was forbidden, is not an absolute and tyrannical command without reason, as now-a-days we make it little better, but is grounded upon some rational cause not difficult to be apprehended, being in a matter which equally concerns the meanest and the plainest sort of persons in a household life. Our next way then will be to enquire if there be not more reasons than one; and if there be, whether this be the best and chiefest. That we shall find by turning to the first institution, to which Christ refers our own reading: he himself having to deal with treacherous assailants, useth brevity, and lighting on the first place in Genesis that mentions any thing tending to marriage in the first chapter, joins it immediately to the twenty-fourth verse of the second chapter, omitting all the prime words between, which create the institution, and contain the noblest and purest ends of matrimony; without which attained, that conjunction hath nothing in it above what is common to us with beasts. So likewise beneath in this very chapter, to the young man who came not tempting him, but to learn of him, asking him which commandments he should keep; he neither repeats the first table, nor all the second, nor that in order which he repeats. If here then being tempted, he desire to be the shorter, and the darker in his conference, and omit to cite that from the second of Genesis, which all divines confess is a commentary to what he cites out of the first, the "making them male and female;" what are we to do, but to search the institution ourselves? And we shall find there his own authority, giving other manner of reasons why such firm union is to be in matrimony; without which reasons, their being male and female can be no cause of joining them inseparably: for if it be, then no adultery can sever. Therefore the prohibition of divorce depends not upon this reason here expressed to the pharisees, but upon the plainer and more eminent causes omitted

ted here, and referred to the institution; which causes not being found in a particular and casual matrimony, this sensitive and material cause alone can no more hinder a divorce against those higher and more human reasons urging it, than it can alone without them to warrant a copulation, but leaves it arbitrary to those who in their chance of marriage find not why divorce is forbid them, but why it is permitted them; and find both here and in Genesis, that the forbidding is not absolute, but according to the reasons there taught us, not here. And that our Saviour taught them no better, but uses the most vulgar, most animal and corporal argument to convince them, is first to shew us, that as thro' their licentious divorces they made no more of marriage, than as if to marry, were no more than to be male and female, so he goes no higher in his confutation; deeming them unworthy to be talked with in a higher strain, but to be tied in marriage by the meer material cause thereof, since their own licence testified that nothing matrimonial was in their thought, but to be male and female. Next, it might be done to discover the brute ignorance of these carnal doctors, who taking on them to dispute of marriage and divorce, were put to silence with such a slender opposition as this, and outed from their hold with scarce one quarter of an argument. That we may believe this, his entertainment of the young man soon after may persuade us. Whom, though he came to preach eternal life by faith only, he dismisses with a salvation taught him by works only. On which place Paræus notes, "That this man was to be convinced by a false persuasion; and that Christ is wont otherwise to answer hypocrites, otherwise those that are docible." Much rather then may we think that in handling these tempters, he forgot not so to frame his prudent ambiguities and concealments, as was to the troubling of those peremptory disputants most wholesome. When therefore we would know what right there may be, in ill accidents, to divorce, we must repair thither where God professes to teach his servants by the prime institution, and not where we see him intending to dazzle sophisters: we must not read, "he made them male and female," and not understand he made them more intendedly "a meet help" to remove the evil of being "alone." We must take both these together, and then we may infer compleatly, as from the whole cause, why a man shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh: but if the full and chief cause why we may not divorce be wanting here, this place may skirmish with the rabbies while it will, but to the true Christian it prohibits nothing beyond the full reason of its own prohibiting, which is best known by the institution.

Ver. 6, "Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh." This is true in the general right of marriage, but not in the chance-medley of every particular match. For if they who were once undoubtedly one flesh, yet become twain by adultery, then sure they who were never one flesh rightly, never helps meet for each other according to the plain prescript of God, may with less ado than a volume be concluded still twain. And so long as we account a magistrate no magistrate, if there be but a flaw in his election, why should we not much rather count a matrimony no matrimony, if it cannot be in any reasonable man ner according to the words of God's institution?

"What therefore God hath joined, let no man put asunder." But here the christian prudence lies to consider what God hath joined; shall we say that God hath joined error, fraud, unfitness, wrath, contention, perpetual loneliness, perpetual discord; whatever lust, or wine, or witchery, threat, or inticement, avarice, or ambition hath joined together, faithful and unfaithful, christian with antichristian, hate with hate, or hate with love; shall we say this is God's joining?

"Let not man put asunder." That is to say, what God hath joined; for if it be, as how oft we see it may be, not of God's joining, and his law tells us he joins not unmatchable things, but hates to join them, as an abominable confusion, then the divine law of Moses puts them asunder, his own divine will in the institution puts them asunder, as oft as the reasons be not extant, for which only God ordained their joining. Man only puts asunder when his inordinate desires, his passion, his violence,

violence, his injury makes the breach : not when the utter want of that which lawfully was the end of his joining, when wrongs and extremities and unsupportable grievances compel him to disjoin : when such as Herod and the pharisees divorce beside law, or against law, then only man separates, and to such only this prohibition belongs. In a word, if it be unlawful for man to put asunder that which God hath joined, let man take heed it be not detestable to join that by compulsion which God hath put asunder.

Ver. 7. " They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away ?"

Ver. 8. " He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives ; but from the beginning it was not so."

" Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you."] Hence the divinity now current, argues that this judicial law of Moses is abolished. But suppose it were so, tho' it hath been proved otherwise, the firmness of such right to divorce as here pleads is fetched from the prime institution, does not stand or fall with the judicial Jew, but is as moral as what is moralest. Yet as I have shewn positively that this law cannot be abrogated, both by the words of our Saviour pronouncing the contrary, and by that unabolishable equity which it conveys to us ; so I shall now bring to view those appearances of strength which are levied from this text to maintain the most gross and massy paradox that ever did violence to reason and religion, bred only under the shadow of these words, to all other piety or philosophy strange and insolent, that God by act of law drew out a line of adultery almost two thousand years long : although to detect the prodigy of this surmise, the former book set forth on this argument hath already been copious. I shall not repeat much, tho' I might borrow of mine own ; but shall endeavour to add something either yet untouched, or not largely enough explained. First, it shall be manifest that the common exposition cannot possibly consist with christian doctrine : next, a truer meaning of this our Saviour's reply shall be left in the room. The received exposition is, that God, though not approving, did enact a law to permit adultery by divorcement simply unlawful. And this conceit they feed with fond supposals that have not the least footing in scripture : as that the Jews learned this custom of divorce in Egypt, and therefore God would not unteach it them till Christ came, but let it stick as a notorious botch of deformity in the midst of his most perfect and severe law. And yet he saith, Levit. the xviiiith, " After the doings of Egypt ye shall not do." Another while they invent a slander (as what thing more bold than teaching ignorance when he shifts to hide his nakedness?) that the Jews were naturally to their wives the cruellest men in the world ; would poison, brain, and do I know not what if they might not divorce. Certain, if it were a fault heavily punished, to bring an evil report upon the land which God gave, what is it to raise a groundless calumny against the people which God made choice of ? But that this bold interpretament, how commonly soever sided with, cannot stand a minute with any competent reverence to God, or his law, or his people, nor with any other maxim of religion, or good manners, might be proved through all the heads and Topics of argumentation ; but I shall willingly be as concise as possible. First the law, not only the moral, but the judicial, given by Moses, is just and pure ; for such is God who gave it. " Hearken O Israel," saith Moses, Deut. iv. " unto the statutes and the judgments which I teach you, to do them, that ye may live, &c. Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you." And onward in the chapter, " Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me. Keep therefore and do them, for this is your wisdom and your understanding. For what nation hath God so nigh unto them, and what nation hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law which I set before ye this day ?"

day?" Is it imaginable there should be among these a law which God allowed not, a law giving permissions laxative to unmarry a wife and marry a lust, a law to suffer a kind of tribunal adultery? Many other scriptures might be brought to assert the purity of this judicial law, and many I have alledged before; this law therefore is pure and just. But if it permit, if it teach, if it defend that which is both unjust and impure, as by the common doctrine it doth, what think we? The three general doctrines of Justinian's law, are "To live in honesty, To hurt no man, To give every one his due." Shall the Roman Civil law observe these three things, as the only end of law, and shall a statute be found in the civil law of God, enacted simply and totally against all these three precepts of nature and morality?

Secondly, The gifts of God are all perfect, and certainly the law is of all his other gifts one of the perfectest. But if it give that outwardly which it takes away really, and give that seemingly, which, if a man take it, wraps him into sin and damns him; what gift of an enemy can be more dangerous and destroying than this?

Thirdly, Moses every-where commends his laws, prefers them before all of other nations, and warrants them to be the way of life and safety to all that walk therein, Lev. xviii. But if they contain statutes which God approves not, and train men unweeting to commit injustice and adultery under the shelter of law; if those things be sin, and death sin's wages, what is this law but the snare of death?

Fourthly, The statutes and judgments of the Lord, which, without exception, are often told us to be such, as doing we may live by them, are doubtless to be counted the rule of knowledge and of conscience. "For I had not known lust," saith the apostle, "but by the law." But if the law come down from the state of her incorruptible majesty to grant lust his boon, palpably it darkens and confounds both knowledge and conscience; it goes against the common office of all goodness and friendliness, which is at least to counsel and admonish; it subverts the rules of all sober education, and is itself a most negligent and debauching tutor.

Fifthly, If the law permits a thing unlawful, it permits that which elsewhere it hath forbid; so that hereby it contradicts itself, and transgresses itself. But if the law become a transgressor, it stands guilty to itself, and how then shall it save another? It makes a confederacy with sin, how then can it justly condemn a sinner? And thus reducing itself to the state of neither saving nor condemning, it will not fail to expire solemnly ridiculous.

Sixthly, The prophets in scripture declare severely against the decreeing of that which is unjust, Psal. xciv. 20. Isaiah x. But it was done, they say, for hardness of heart: To which objection the apostle's rule, "not to do evil that good may come thereby," gives an invincible repulse; and here especially, where it cannot be shewn how any good came by doing this evil, how rather more evil did not hereon abound; for the giving way to hardness of heart hardens the more, and adds more to the number. God to an evil and adulterous generation would not "grant a sign;" much less would he for their hardness of heart pollute his law with adulterous permission. Yea, but to permit evil, is not to do evil. Yes, it is in a most eminent manner to do evil: where else are all our grave and faithful sayings, that he whose office is to forbid and forbids not, bids, exhorts, encourages? Why hath God denounced his anger against parents, masters, friends, magistrates, neglectful of forbidding what they ought, if law, the common father, master, friend, and perpetual magistrate shall not only not forbid, but enact, exhibit, and uphold with countenance and protection, a deed every way dishonest, whatever the pretence be? If it were of those inward vices, which the law cannot by outward constraint remedy, but leaves to conscience and persuasion, it had been guiltless in being silent: but to write a decree of that which can be no way lawful, and might with ease be hindered, makes law by the doom of law itself accessory in the highest degree.

Seventhly,

Seventhly, it makes God the direct author of sin: For although he be not made the author of what he silently permits in his providence, yet in his law, the image of his will, when in plain expression he constitutes and ordains a fact utterly unlawful; what wants he to authorize it, and what wants that to be the author?

Eighthly, to establish by law a thing wholly unlawful and dishonest, is an affirmation was never heard of before in any law, reason, philosophy, or religion, till it was raised by inconsiderate glossists from the mistake of this text. And though the civilians have been contented to chew this opinion, after the canon had subdued them, yet they never could bring example or authority either from divine writ, or human learning, or human practice in any nation, or well-formed republic, but only from the customary abuse of this text. Usually they alledge the epistle of Cicero to Atticus; wherein Cato is blamed for giving sentence to the scum of Romulus, as if he were in Plato's commonwealth. Cato would have called some great one into judgment for bribery; Cicero, as the time stood, advised against it. Cato, not to endamage the publick treasury, would not grant to the Roman knights, that the Asian taxes might be farmed them at a less rate. Cicero wished it granted. Nothing in all this will be like the establishing of a law to sin: Here are no laws made, here only the execution of law is craved might be suspended: between which and our question is a broad difference. And what if human lawgivers have confessed they could not frame their laws to that perfection which they desired? We hear of no such confession from Moses concerning the laws of God, but rather all praise and high testimony of perfection given them. And although man's nature cannot bear exactest laws, yet still within the confines of good it may and must, so long as less good is far enough from altogether evil. As for what they instance of usury, let them first prove usury to be wholly unlawful, as the law allows it; which learned men as numerous on the other side will deny them. Or if it be altogether unlawful, why is it tolerated more than divorce? He who said, divorce not, said also, "Lend, hoping for nothing again," Luke vi. 35. But then they put in, that trade could not stand, and so to serve the commodity of insatiable trading, usury shall be permitted: but divorce, the only means oft-times to right the innocent and outrageously wronged, shall be utterly forbid. This is egregious doctrine, and for which one day charity will much thank them. Beza not finding how to salve this perplexity, and Cameron since him, would secure us; although the latter confesses, that to "permit a wicked thing by law, is a wickedness which God abhors; yet to limit sin, and prescribe it a certain measure, is good." First, this evasion will not help here; for this law bounded no man; he might put away whatever found not favour in his eyes. And how could it forbid to divorce, whom it could not forbid to dislike, or command to love? If these be the limits of law to restrain sin, who so lame a sinner but may hop over them more easily than over those Romulean circumscriptions, not as Remus did with hard success, but with all indemnity? Such a limiting as this were not worth the mischief that accompanies it. This law therefore not bounding the supposed sin, by permitting enlarges it, gives it enfranchisement. And never greater confusion, than when law and sin move their landmarks, mix their territories, and correspond, have intercourse and traffic together. When law contracts a kindred and hospitality with transgression, becomes the godfather of sin, and names it lawful; when sin revels, and gossips within the arsenal of law, plays and dandles the artillery of justice that should be bent against her, this is a fair limitation indeed. Besides, it is an absurdity to say that law can measure sin, or moderate sin; sin is not in a predicament, to be measured and modified, but is always an excess. The least sin that is, exceeds the measure of the largest law that can be good; and is as boundless as that vacuity beyond the world. If once it square to the measure of law, it ceases to be an excess, and consequently ceases to be a sin; or else law conforming itself to the obliquity of sin, betrays itself to be not streight, but crooked, and so immediately no law. And the improper conceit of moderating sin by law, will appear, if we can imagine any law-giver

giver so senseless as to decree that so far a man may steal, and thus far be drunk, that moderately he may cozen, and moderately commit adultery. To the same extent it would be as pithily absurd to publish that a man may moderately divorce, if to do that be entirely naught. But to end this moot; the law of Moses is manifest to fix no limit therein at all, or such at least as impeaches the fraudulent abuser no more than if it were not set; only requires the dismissive writing without other caution, leaves that to the inner man, and the bar of conscience. But it stoppeth other sins. This is as vain as the rest, and dangerously uncertain: the contrary to be feared rather, that one sin admitted courteously by law, opened the gate to another. However, evil must not be done for good. And it were a fall to be lamented, and indignity unspeakable, if law should become tributary to sin her slave, and forced to yield up into his hands her awful minister, punishment; should buy out her peace with sin for sin, paying as it were her so many Philistian foreskins to the proud demand of transgression. But suppose it any way possible to limit sin, to put a girdle about that Chaos, suppose it also good; yet if to permit sin by law be an abomination in the eyes of God, as Cameron acknowledges, the evil of permitting will eat out the good of limiting. For though sin be not limited, there can but evil come out of evil; but if it be permitted and decreed lawful by divine law, of force then sin must proceed from the infinite good, which is a dreadful thought. But if the restraining of sin by this permission being good, as this author testifies, be more good than the permission of more sin by the restraint of divorce, and that God weighing both these like two ingots, in the perfect scales of his justice and providence, found them so, and others coming without authority from God, shall change this counterpoise, and judge it better to let sin multiply by setting a judicial restraint upon divorce, which Christ never set; then to limit sin by this permission, as God himself thought best to permit it, it will behove them to consult betimes whether these their ballances be not false and abominable; and this their limiting that which God loosened, and their loosening the sins that he limited, which they confess was good to do: and were it possible to do by law, doubtless it would be most morally good; and they so believing, as we hear they do, and yet abolishing a law so good and moral, the limiter of sin, what are they else but contrary to themselves? For they can never bring us to that time wherein it will not be good to limit sin, and they can never limit it better than so as God prescribed in his law.

Others conceive it a more defensible retirement to say, this permission to divorce sinfully for hardness of heart was a dispensation. But surely they either know not, or attended not to what a dispensation means. A dispensation is for no long time, is particular to some persons, rather than general to a whole people; always hath charity the end, is granted to necessities and infirmities, not to obstinate lust. This permission is another creature, hath all those evils and absurdities following the name of a dispensation, as when it was named a law; and is the very antarctic pole against charity, nothing more adverse, ensnaring and ruining those that trust in it, or use it; so leud and criminous as never durst enter into the head of any Politician, Jew, or Profelyte, till they became the apt scholars of this canonistic exposition. Aught in it, that can allude in the least manner to charity, or goodness, belongs with more full right to the Christian under grace and liberty, than to the Jew under law and bondage. To Jewish ignorance it could not be dispensed, without a horrid imputation laid upon the law, to dispense foully, instead of teaching fairly; like that dispensation that first polluted Christendom with idolatry, permitting to laymen images instead of books and preaching. Sloth or malice in the law would they have this called? But what ignorance can be pretended for the Jews, who had all the same precepts about marriage, that we now? for Christ refers all to the institution. It was as reasonable for them to know then as for us now, and concerned them alike: for wherein hath the gospel altered the nature of matrimony? All these considerations, or many of them, have been further amplified in "the Doctrine of Divorce." And what Rivetus and Paræus have objected, or given over as past cure, hath been

there discussed. Whereby it may be plain enough to men of eyes, that the vulgar exposition of a permittance by law to an intire sin, whatever the colour may be, is an opinion both ungodly, unpolitic, unvirtuous, and void of all honesty and civil sense. It appertains therefore to every zealous christian both for the honour of God's law, and the vindication of our Saviour's words, that such an irreligious depravement no longer may be soothed and flattered through custom, but with all diligence and speed solidly refuted, and in the room a better explanation given; which is now our next endeavour.

"Moses suffered you to put away," &c.] Not commanded you, says the common observer, and therefore cared not how soon it were abolished, being but suffered; herein declaring his annotation to be slight, and nothing law-prudent. For in this place 'commanded' and 'suffered' are interchangeably used in the same sense both by our Saviour and the Pharisees. Our Saviour, who here saith, "Moses suffered you," in the 10th of Mark saith, "Moses wrote you this command." And the Pharisees who here say, "Moses commanded," and would mainly have it a command, in that place of Mark say, "Moses suffered," which had made against them in their own mouths, if the word of "suffering" had weakened the command. So that suffered and commanded is here taken for the same thing on both sides of the controversy: as Cameron also and others on this place acknowledge. And lawyers know that all the precepts of law are divided into obligatory and permissive, containing either what we must do, or what we may do; and of this latter sort are as many precepts as of the former, and all as lawful. Tutelage, an ordainment than which nothing more just, being for the defence of orphans, the Institutes of Justinian say "is given and permitted by the civil law: and "to parents it is permitted to chuse and appoint by will the guardians of their Children." What more equal, and yet the civil law calls this "permission." So likewise to "manumise," to adopt, to make a will, and to be made an heir, is called "permission" by law. Marriage itself, and this which is already granted, to divorce for adultery, obliges no man, is but a permission by law, is but suffered. By this we may see how weakly it hath been thought that all divorce is utterly unlawful, because the law is said to suffer it: whenas to "suffer" is but the legal phrase denoting what by law a man may do or not do.

"Because of the hardness of your hearts."] Hence they argue that therefore he allowed it not; and therefore it must be abolished. But the contrary to this will sooner follow, that because he suffered it for a cause, therefore in relation to that cause he allowed it. Next, if he in his wisdom, and in the midst of his severity allowed it for hardness of heart, it can be nothing better than arrogance and presumption to take stricter courses against hardness of heart, than God ever set an example; and that under the gospel, which warrants them to no judicial act of compulsion in this matter, much less to be more severe against hardness of extremity, than God thought good to be against hardness of heart. He suffered it, rather than worse inconveniences; these men wiser, as they make themselves, will suffer the worst and heinouslest inconveniences to follow, rather than they will suffer what God suffered. Although they can know when they please, that Christ spake only to the conscience, did not judge on the civil bench, but always disavowed it. What can be more contrary to the ways of God, than these their doings? If they be such enemies to hardness of heart, although this groundless rigor proclaims it to be in themselves, they may yet learn, or consider that hardness of heart hath a twofold acceptation in the Gospel. One, when it is in a good man taken for infirmity, and imperfection, which was in all the apostles, whose weakness only, not utter want of belief, is called hardness of heart, Mark xvi. Partly for this hardness of heart, the imperfection and decay of man from original righteousness, it was that God suffered not divorce only, but all that which by Civilians is termed the "secondary law of nature and of nations." He suffered his own people to waste and spoil and slay by war, to lead captives, to be some masters, some servants, some to be princes, others to be subjects; he suffered

suffered propriety to divide all things by several possession, trade and commerce, not without usury; in his commonwealth some to be undeservedly rich, others to be undeservingly poor. All which, till hardness of heart came in, was most unjust; whenas prime nature made us all equal, made us equal coheirs by common right and dominion over all creatures. In the same manner, and for the same cause he suffered divorce as well as marriage, our imperfect and degenerate condition of necessity requiring this law among the rest, as a remedy against intolerable wrong and servitude above the patience of man to bear. Nor was it given only because our infirmity, or if it must be so called, hardness of heart could not endure all things; but because the hardness of another's heart might not inflict all things upon an innocent person, whom far other ends brought into a league of love, and not of bondage and indignity." If therefore we abolish divorce as only suffered for hardness of heart, we may as well abolish the whole law of nations, as only suffered for the same cause; it being shewn us by St. Paul, 1 Cor. vi. that the very seeking of a man's right by law, and at the hands of a worldly magistrate, is not without the hardness of our hearts. "For why do ye not rather take wrong," saith he, "why suffer ye not rather yourselves to be defrauded? If nothing now must be suffered for hardness of heart, I say the very prosecution of our right by way of civil justice can no more be suffered among Christians, for the hardness of heart wherewith most men pursue it. And that would next remove all our judicial laws, and this restraint of divorce also in the number; which would more than half end the controversy. But if it be plain that the whole juridical law and civil power is only suffered under the gospel, for the hardness of our hearts, then wherefore should not that which Moses suffered, be suffered still by the same reason?"

In a second signification, hardness of heart is taken for a stubborn resolution to do evil. And that God ever makes any law purposely to such, I deny; for he vouchsafes not to enter covenant with them, but as they fortune to be mixt with good men, and pass undiscovered; much less that he should decree an unlawful thing only to serve their licentiousness. But that God "suffers" this reprobate hardness of heart I affirm, not only in this law of divorce, but throughout all his best and purest commandments. He commands all to worship in singleness of heart according to all his ordinances; and yet suffers the wicked man to perform all the rites of religion hypocritically, and in the hardness of his heart. He gives us general statutes and privileges in all civil matters, just and good of themselves, yet suffers unworthiest men to use them, and by them to prosecute their own right, or any colour of right, though for the most part maliciously, covetously, rigorously, revengefully. He allowed by law the discreet father and husband to forbid, if he thought fit, the religious vows of his wife or daughter, Numb. xxx. and in the same law suffered the hardheartedness of impious and covetous fathers or husbands abusing this law to forbid their wives or daughters in their offerings and devotions of greatest zeal. If then God suffer hardness of heart equally in the best laws, as in this of divorce, there can be no reason that for this cause this law should be abolished. But other laws, they object, may be well used, this never. How often shall I answer, both from the institution of marriage, and from other general rules in scripture, that this law of divorce hath many wise and charitable ends besides the being suffered for hardness of heart, which is indeed no end, but an accident happening through the whole law; which gives to good men right, and to bad men, who abuse right under false pretences, gives only sufferance. Now although Christ express no other reasons here, but only what was suffered, it nothing follows that this law had no other reason to be permitted but for hardness of heart. The scripture seldom or never in one place sets down all the reasons of what it grants or commands, especially when it talks to enemies and tempters. St. Paul permitting marriage, 1 Cor. vii. seems to permit even that also for hardness of heart only, lest we should run into fornication; yet no intelligent man thence concludes marriage allowed in the gospel only to avoid an evil, because no other end is there expressed.

expressed. Thus Moses of necessity suffered many to put away their wives for hardness of heart; but enacted the law of divorce doubtless for other good causes, not for this only sufferance. He permitted not divorce by law as an evil, for that was impossible to divine law, but permitted by accident the evil of them who divorced against the law's intention undiscoverably. This also may be thought not improbably, that Christ, stirred up in his spirit against these tempting Pharisees, answered them in a certain form of indignation usual among good authors; whereby the question, or the truth is not directly answered, but something which is fitter for them, who ask, to hear. So in the ecclesiastical stories, one demanding how God employed himself before the world was made? had answer, that he was making hell for curious questioners. Another (and Libanius the Sophist, as I remember) asking in derision some Christian, What the Carpenter, meaning our Saviour, was doing, now that Julian so prevailed? had it returned him, that the Carpenter was making a coffin for the Apostate. So Christ being demanded maliciously why Moses made the law of divorce, answers them in a vehement Scheme, not telling them the cause why he made it, but what was fittest to be told them, that "for the hardness of their hearts" he suffered them to abuse it. And albeit Mark say not "he suffered" you, but "to you he wrote this precept;" Mark may be warrantably expounded by Matthew the larger. And whether he suffered, or gave precept, being all one as was heard, it changes not the trope of indignation, fittest account for such askers. Next, for the hardness of "your hearts, to you he wrote this precept, infers not therefore for this cause only he wrote it, as was paralleled by other scriptures. Lastly, it may be worth the observing, that Christ speaking to the Pharisees, does not say in general that for hardness of heart he gave this precept, but "you he suffered and to you he gave this precept for your hardness of heart." It cannot be easily thought that Christ here included all the children of Israel under the person of these tempting Pharisees, but that he conceals wherefore he gave the better sort of them this law, and expresses by saying emphatically "To you" how he gave it to the worser, such as the Pharisees best represented, that is to say, for the hardness of your hearts: as indeed to wicked men and hardened hearts he gives the whole law and the gospel also, to harden them the more. Thus many ways it may orthodoxally be understood how God or Moses suffered such as the demanders were, to divorce for hardness of heart. Whereas the vulgar expositor, beset with contradictions and absurdities round, and resolving at any peril to make an exposition of it, (as there is nothing more violent and boisterous than a reverend ignorance in fear to be convicted) rushes brutally and impetuously against all the principles both of nature, piety, and moral goodness; and in the fury of his literal expounding overturns them all.

"But from the beginning it was not so."] Not how from the beginning? Do they suppose that men might not divorce at all, not necessarily, not deliberately, except for adultery, but that some law, like canon law, presently attached them both before and after the flood, till stricter Moses came, and with law brought licence into the world? that were a fancy indeed to smile at. Undoubtedly as to point of judicial law, divorce was more permissive from the beginning before Moses than under Moses. But from the beginning, that is to say, by the institution in paradise, it was not intended that matrimony should dissolve for every trivial cause, as you Pharisees accustom. But that it was not thus suffered from the beginning ever since the race of men corrupted, and laws were made, he who will affirm, must have found out other antiquities than are yet known. Besides, we must consider now, what can be so as from the beginning, not only what should be so. In the beginning, had men continued perfect, it had been just that all things should have remained, as they began to Adam and Eve. But after that the sons of men grew violent and injurious, it altered the lore of justice, and put the government of things into a new frame. While man and woman were both perfect each to other, there needed no divorce; but when they both degenerated to imperfection, and
oft-times

oft-times grew to be an intolerable evil each to other, then law more justly did permit the alienating of that evil which mistake made proper, than it did the appropriating of that good which nature at first made common. For if the absence of outward good be not so bad as the presence of a close evil, and that propriety, whether by covenant or possession, be but the attainment of some outward good, it is more natural and righteous that the law should sever us from an intimate evil, than appropriate any outward good to us from the community of nature. The gospel indeed tending ever to that which is perfectest, aimed at the restorement of all things as they were in the beginning; and therefore all things were in common to those primitive christians in the acts, which Ananias and Sapphira dearly felt. That custom also continued more or less till the time of Justin Martyr, as may be read in his second Apology, which might be writ after that act of communion perhaps some forty years above a hundred. But who will be the man that shall introduce this kind of commonwealth, as christianity now goes? If then marriage must be as in the beginning, the persons that marry must be such as then were; the institution must make good, in some tolerable sort, what it promises to either party. If not, it is but madness to drag this one ordinance back to the beginning, and draw down all other to the present necessity and condition, far from the beginning, even to the tolerating of extortions and oppressions. Christ only told us that from the beginning it was not so; that is to say, not so as the Pharisees manured the business; did not command us that it should be forcibly so again in all points, as at the beginning; or so at least in our intentions and desires, but so in execution, as reason and present nature can bear. Although we are not to seek, that the institution itself from the first beginning was never but conditional, as all covenants are: because thus and thus, therefore so and so; if not thus, then not so. Then moreover was perfectest to fulfil each law in itself; now is perfectest in this estate of things, to ask of charity how much law may be fulfilled: else the fulfilling, oft-times is the greatest breaking. If any therefore demand, which is now most perfection, to ease an extremity by divorce, or to enrage and fester it by the grievous observance of a miserable wedloc, I am not destitute to say which is most perfection, (although some who believe they think favourably of divorce, esteem it only venial to infirmity.) Him I hold more in the way to perfection, who forgoes an unfit, ungodly, and discordant wedloc, to live according to peace and love, and God's institution in a fitter choice, than he who debars himself the happy experience of all godly, which is peaceful conversation in his family, to live a contentious, and unchristian life not to be avoided, in temptations not to be lived in, only for the false keeping of a most unreal nullity, a marriage that hath no affinity with God's intention, a daring phantasm, a mere toy of terror awing weak senses, to the lamentable superstition of ruining themselves; the remedy whereof God in his law vouchsafes us. Which not to dare use, he warranting, is not our perfection, is our infirmity, our little faith, our timorous and low conceit of charity: and in them who force us, it is their masking pride and vanity, to seem holier and more circumspect than God. So far is it that we need impute to him infirmity, who thus divorces: since the rule of perfection is not so much that which was done in the beginning, as that which is now nearest to the rule of charity. This is the greatest, the perfectest, the highest commandment.

Ver. 9. "And I say unto you, whoso shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is put away, doth commit adultery."

"And I say unto you."] That this restrictive denouncement of Christ contradicts and refutes that permissive precept of Moses, common expositors themselves disclaim: and that it does not traverse from the closet of conscience to the courts of civil or canon law, with any christian rightly commenced, requires not long evincing. If Christ then did not here check permissive Moses, nor did reduce matrimony to the beginning more than
all

all other things, as the reason of man's condition could bear; we would know precisely what it was which he did, and what the end was of his declaring thus austerely against divorce. For this is a confessed oracle in law, that he who looks not at the intention of a precept, the more superstitious he is of the letter, the more he misinterprets. Was it to shame Moses? that had been monstrous: or all those purest ages of Israel, to whom the permission was granted? that were as incredible. Or was it that he who came to abrogate the burden of law, not the equity, should put this yoke upon a blameless person, to league himself in chains with a begirting mischief, not to separate till death? He who taught us that no man puts a piece of new cloth upon an old garment, nor new wine into old bottles, that he should sew this patch of strictness upon the old apparel of our frailty, to make a rent more incurable, whenas in all other amendments his doctrine still charges, that regard be had to the garment, and to the vessel, what it can endure; this were an irregular and single piece of rigour, not only sounding disproportion to the whole gospel, but outstretching the most rigorous nerves of law and rigour itself. No other end therefore can be left imaginable of this excessive restraint, but to bridle those erroneous and licentious postillers the pharisees; not by telling them what may be done in necessity, but what censure they deserve who divorce abusively, which their Tetrarch had done. And as the offence was in one extreme, so the rebuke, to bring more efficaciously to a rectitude and mediocrity, stands not in the middle way of duty, but in the other extreme. Which art of powerful reclaiming, wisest men have also taught in their ethical precepts and Gnomologies, resembling it, as when we bend a crooked wand the contrary way; not that it should stand so bent, but that the overbending might reduce it to a straightness by its own reluctance. And as the physician cures him who hath taken down poison, not by the middling temper of nourishment, but by the other extreme of Antidote, so Christ administers here a sharp and corrosive sentence against a foul and putrid licence; not to eat into the flesh, but into the fore. And knowing that our divines through all their comments make no scruple, where they please, to soften the high and vehement speeches of our Saviour, which they call Hyperboles; why in this one text should they be such crabbed Masorites of the letter, as not to mollify a transcendence of literal rigidity, which they confess to find often elsewhere in his manner of delivery, but must make their exposition here such an obdurate Cyclops, to have but one eye for this text, and that only open to cruelty and enthrallment, such as no divine or human law before ever heard of? No, let the foppish canonist, with his fardel of matrimonial cases, go and be vendible where men be so unhappy as to cheapen him: the words of Christ shall be asserted from such elemental notaries, and resolved by the now-only lawgiving mouth of charity; which may be done undoubtedly by understanding them as follows.

“Whoever shall put away his wife.”] That is to say, shall so put away as the propounders of this question, the pharisees, were wont to do, and covertly defended Herod for so doing; whom to rebuke, our Saviour here mainly intends, and not to determine all the cases of divorce, as appears by St. Paul. Whoever shall put away, either violently without mutual consent for urgent reasons, or conspiringly by plot of lust, or cunning malice, shall put away for any sudden mood, or contingency of disagreement, which is not daily practice, but may blow soon over, and be reconciled, except it be fornication; whoever shall put away rashly, as his choler prompts him, without due time of deliberating, and think his conscience discharged only by the bill of divorce given, and the outward law satisfied; whoever, lastly, shall put away his wife, that is a wife indeed, and not in name only, such a one who both can and is willing to be a meet help toward the chief ends of marriage both civil and sanctified, except fornication be the cause, that man, or that pair, commit adultery. Not he who puts away by mutual consent, with all the considerations and respects of humanity and gentleness, without malicious or lustful drift. Not he who after sober and cool experience, and long debate within himself, puts away, whom though he cannot love or suffer as a wife, with that sincere affection that

marriage requires, yet loves at least with that civility and goodness, as not to keep her under a neglected and unwelcome residence, where nothing can be hearty, and not being, it must needs be both unjoyous, and injurious to any perceiving person so detained, and more injurious than to be freely, and upon good terms dismissed. Nor doth he put away adulterously who complains of causes rooted in immutable nature, utter unfitness, utter disconformity, not conciliable, because not to be amended without a miracle. Nor he who puts away an unquenchable vexation from his bosom, and flies an evil, than which a greater cannot befall human society. Nor he who puts away with the full suffrage and applause of his conscience, not relying on the written bill of law, but claiming by faith and fulness of persuasion the rights and promises of God's institution, of which he finds himself in a mistaken wedlock defrauded. Doubtless this man hath bail enough to be no adulterer, giving divorce for these causes.

"His wife."] This word is not to be idle here, a mere word without a sense, much less a fallacious word signifying contrary to what it pretends; but faithfully signifies a wife, that is, a comfortable help and society, as God instituted; does not signify deceitfully under this name, an intolerable adversary, not a helpless, unaffectionate and fullen mass, whose very company represents the visible and exactest figure of loneliness itself. Such an associate he who puts away, divorces not a wife, but disjoins a nullity which God never joined, if she be neither willing, nor to her proper and requisite duties sufficient, as the words of God institute her. And this also is Bucer's explication of this place.

"Except it be for fornication," or "saving for the cause of fornication," as Matt. v.] This declares what kind of causes our Saviour meant; fornication being no natural and perpetual cause, but only accidental and temporary; therefore shews that head of causes from whence it is excepted, to be meant of the same sort. For exceptions are not logically deduced from a diverse kind, as to say who so puts away for any natural cause except fornication, the exception would want salt. And if they understand it, who so for any cause whatever, they cast themselves; granting divorce for frigidity a natural cause of their own allowing, though not here expressed, and for desertion without infidelity, whenas he who marries, as they allow him for desertion, deserts as well as is deserted, and finally puts away for another cause besides adultery. It will with all due reason therefore be thus better understood, who so puts away for any accidental and temporary causes, except one of them, which is fornication. Thus this exception finds out the causes from whence it is excepted, to be of the same kind, that is casual, not continual.

"Saving for the cause of fornication." The New Testament, though it be said originally writ in Greek, yet hath nothing near so many Atticisms as Hebraisms, and Syriacisms, which was the majesty of God, not filing the tongue of Scripture to a gentileish Idiom, but in a princely manner offering to them as to Gentiles and foreigners grace and mercy, though not in foreign words, yet in a foreign stile that might induce them to the fountains; and though their calling were high and happy, yet still to acknowledge God's ancient people their betters, and that language the Metropolitan language. He therefore who thinks to scholiaz upon the gospel, though Greek, according to his Greek Analogies, and hath not been auditor to the oriental dialects, shall want in the heat of his Analysis no accommodation to stumble. In this place, as the v. of Matth. reads it, "Saving for the cause of fornication," the Greek, such as it is, sounds it, except for the "word, report, speech, or proportion" of fornication. In which regard, with other inducements, many ancient and learned writers have understood this exception, as comprehending any fault equivalent and proportional to fornication. But truth is, the evangelist here hebraizes, taking "word or speech for cause or matter" in the common Eastern phrase, meaning perhaps no more than if he had said for fornication, as in this xix. chapter. And yet the word is found in the v. of Exodus also signifying "proportion; where the Israelites are commanded to do their tasks, "the matter of each day in his day." A task we know is a proportion of work, not doing the same thing absolutely every

every day, but so much. Whereby it may be doubtful yet, whether here be not excepted not only fornication itself, but other causes equipollent, and proportional to fornication. Which very word also to understand rightly, we must of necessity have recourse again to the Hebrew. For in the Greek and Latin sense by fornication is meant the common prostitution of body for sale. So that they who are so exact for the letter shall be dealt with by the Lexicon, and the Etymologicon too if they please, and must be bound to forbid divorce for adultery also, until it come to open whoredom and trade, like that for which Claudius divorced Messalina. Since therefore they take not here the word fornication in the common significance, for an open exercise in the stews, but grant divorce for one single act of privatest adultery, notwithstanding that the word speaks a public and notorious frequency of fact, not without price; we may reason with as good leave, and as little straining to the text, that our Saviour on set purpose chose this word Fornication, improperly applied to the lapse of adultery, that we might not think ourselves bound from all divorce, except when that fault hath been actually committed. For the language of Scripture signifies by fornication (and others besides St. Austin so expounded it) not only the trespass of body, nor perhaps that between married persons, unless in a degree or quality as shameless as the Bordello; but signifies also any notable disobedience, or intractable carriage of the wife to the husband, as Judg. xix. 2. whereof at large in "the doctrine of divorce," l. 2. c. 18. Secondly, signifies the apparent alienation of mind not to idolatry, (which may seem to answer the act of adultery) but far on this side, to any point of will-worship, though to the true God; sometimes it notes the love of earthly things, or worldly pleasures, though in a right believer, sometimes the least suspicion of unwitting idolatry. As Numb. xv. 39. wilful disobedience to any the least of God's commandment is called fornication, Psal. lxxiii. 26, 27. A distrust only in God, and withdrawing from that nearness of zeal and confidence which ought to be, is called fornication. We may be sure it could not import thus much less than idolatry in the borrowed metaphor between God and man, unless it signified as much less than adultery in the ordinary acceptation between man and wife. Add also, that there was no need our Saviour should grant divorce for adultery, it being death by law, and law then in force. Which was the cause why Joseph sought to put away his betrothed wife privately, lest he should make her an example of capital punishment, as learnedest expounders affirm. Herod being a great zealot of the Mosaic law, and the Pharisees great masters of the text, as the woman taken in adultery doubtless had cause to fear. Or if they can prove it was neglected, which they cannot do, why did our Saviour shape his answer to the corruption of that age, and not rather tell them of their neglect? If they say he came not to meddle with their judicatures, much less then was it in his thought to make them new ones, or that divorce should be judicially restrained in a stricter manner by these his words, more than adultery judicially acquitted by those his words to the adulterers. His sentence doth no more by law forbid divorce here, than by law it doth absolve adultery there. To them therefore who have drawn this yoke upon christians from his words thus wrested, nothing remains but the guilt of a presumption and perverseness, which will be hard for them to answer. Thus much that the word fornication is to be understood as the language of Christ understands it for a constant alienation and disaffection of mind, or for the continual practice of disobedience and crossness from the duties of love and peace; that is in sum, when to be a tolerable wife is either naturally not in their power, or obstinately not in their will: and this opinion also is St. Austin's, lest it should hap to be suspected of novelty. Yet grant the thing here meant were only adultery, the reason of things will afford more to our assertion, than did the reason of words. For why is divorce unlawful but only for adultery? because, say they, that crime only breaks the matrimony. But this, I reply, the institution, itself gainsays: for that which is most contrary to the words and meaning of the institution, that most breaks the matrimony; but a perpetual unmeetness and unwillingness to all the duties of help, of love, and tranquillity, is most

contrary to the words and meaning of the institution; that therefore much more breaks matrimony than the act of adultery, though repeated. For this, as it is not felt, nor troubles him who perceives it not, so being perceived, may be soon repented, soon amended, soon, if it can be pardoned, may be redeemed with the more ardent love and duty in her who hath the pardon. But this natural unmeetness both cannot be unknown long, and ever after cannot be amended, if it be natural, and will not, if it be far gone obstinate. So that wanting aught in the instant to be as great a breach as adultery, it gains it in the perpetuity to be greater. Next, adultery does not exclude her other fitness, her other pleasingness; she may be otherwise both loving and prevalent, as many adulteresses be; but in this general unfitness or alienation she can be nothing to him that can please. In adultery nothing is given from the husband, which he misses, or enjoys the less, as it may be subtly given: but this unfitness defrauds him of the whole contentment which is sought in wedlock. And what benefit to him, though nothing be given by the stealth of adultery to another, if that which there is to give, whether it be solace, or society, be not such as may justly content him? and so not only deprives him of what it should give him, but gives him sorrow and affliction, which it did not owe him. Besides, is adultery the greatest breach of matrimony in respect of the offence to God, or of the injury to man? If in the former, then other sins may offend God more, and sooner cause him to disunite his servant from being one flesh with such an offender. If in respect of the latter, other injuries are demonstrated therein more heavy to man's nature than the iterated act of adultery. God therefore, in his wisdom, would not so dispose his remedies, as to provide them for the less injuries, and not allow them for the greater. Thus is won both from the word fornication, and the reason of adultery, that the exception of divorce is not limited to that act, but enlarged to the causes above specified.

“And whoso marrieth her which is put away, doth commit adultery.”] By this clause alone, if by nothing else, we may assure us, that Christ intended not to deliver here the whole doctrine of divorce, but only to condemn abuses. Otherwise to marry after desertion, which the apostle, and the reformed churches at this day permit, is here forbid, as adultery. Be she never so wrongfully deserted, or put away, as the law then suffered, if thus forsaken and expelled, she accept the refuge and protection of any honest man who would love her better, and give herself in marriage to him; by what the letter guides us, it shall be present adultery to them both. This is either harsh and cruel, or all the churches teaching as they do to the contrary, are loose and remiss; besides that the apostle himself stands deeply fined in a contradiction against our Saviour. What shall we make of this? what rather the common interpreter can make of it, for they be his own markets, let him now try; let him try which way he can wind in his Virtumnian distinctions and evasions, if his canonical gabardine of text and letter do not now sit too close about him, and pinch his activity; which if I err not, hath here hampered itself in a spring fit for those who put their confidence in alphabets. Spanheim a writer of “*Evangelic Doubts*,” comes now and confesses that our Saviour's words are “to be limited beyond the limitation there expressed, and excepted beyond their own exception,” as not speaking of what happened rarely, but what most commonly. Is it so rare, Spanheim, to be deserted? or was it then so rare to put away injuriously, that a person so hatefully expelled, should to the heaping of more injury be turned like an infectious thing out of all marriage-fruition upon pain of adultery, as not considerable to the brevity of this half sentence? Of what then speaks our Saviour? “of that collusion,” saith he, “which was then most frequent among the Jews, of changing wives and husbands through inconstancy and unchaste desires.” Colluders yourselves, as violent to this law of God by your unmerciful binding, as the pharisees by their unbounded loosening! Have thousands of christian souls perished as to this life, and God knows what hath betided their consciences, for want of this healing explanation; and is it now at last obscurely drawn forth, only to cure a scratch, and leave the main wound spouting? “Whosoever putteth away his wife, except for fornication,

committeth adultery." That shall be spoke of all ages, and all men, though never so justly otherwise moved to divorce: in the very next breath, "And whoso marrieth her which is put away, committeth adultery:" the men are new and miraculous, they tell you now, "you are to limit it to that age, when it was in fashion to chop matrimonies; and must be meant of him who puts away with his wife's consent through the lightness and leudness of them both." But by what rule of logic, or indeed of reason, is our commission to understand the Antecedent one way and the Consequent another? for in that habitude this whole verse may be considered: or at least to take the parts of a copulate axiom, both absolutely affirmative, and to say, the first is absolutely true, the other not, but must be limited to a certain time and custom; which is no less than to say they are both false? For in this compound axiom, be the parts never so many, if one of them do but falter, and be not equally absolute and general, the rest are all false. If therefore, that "he who marries her which is put away commits adultery," be not generally true, neither is it generally true that "he commits adultery who puts away for other cause than fornication." And if the marrying her which is put away, must be understood limited, which they cannot but yield it must, with the same limitation must be understood the putting away. Thus doth the common exposition confound itself, and justify this which is here brought; that our Saviour as well in the first part of this sentence as in the second, prohibited only such divorces as the Jews then made through malice or through plotted licence, not those which are for necessary and just causes; where charity and wisdom disjoins, that which not God, but error and disaster joined.

And there is yet to this our exposition, a stronger siding friend, than any can be an adversary, unless St. Paul be doubted, who repeating a command concerning divorce, 1 Cor. vii. which is agreed by writers to be the same with this of our Saviour, and appointing that the "wife remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband," leaves it infallible that our Saviour spake chiefly against putting away for casual and cholerick disagreements, or any other cause which may with human patience and wisdom be reconciled; not hereby meaning to hale and dash together the irreconcilable averfations of nature, nor to tie up a faultless person like a parricide, as it were into one sack with an enemy, to be his causeless tormenter and executioner the length of a long life. Lastly, let this sentence of Christ be understood how it will, yet that it was never intended for a judicial law, to be enforced by the magistrate, besides that the office of our Saviour had no such purpose in the gospel, this latter part of the sentence may assure us, "And whoso marrieth her which is put away, commits adultery." Shall the exception for adultery belong to this clause or not? If not, it would be strange, that he who marries a woman really divorced for adultery, as Christ permitted, should become an adulterer by marrying one who is now no other man's wife, himself being also free, who might by this means reclaim her from common whoredom. And if the exception must belong hither, then it follows that he who marries an adulteress divorced commits no adultery; which would soon discover to us what an absurd and senseless piece of injustice this would be, to make a civil statute of in penal courts: whereby the adulteress put away may marry another safely, and without a crime to him that marries her; but the innocent and wrongfully divorced shall not marry again without the guilt of adultery both to herself and to her second husband. This saying of Christ therefore cannot be made a temporal law, were it but for this reason. Nor is it easy to say what coherence there is at all in it from the letter, to any perfect sense not obnoxious to some absurdity, and seems much less agreeable to whatever else of the gospel is left us written; doubtless by our Saviour spoken in that fierceness and abstruse intricacy, first to amuse his tempters, and admonish in general the abusers of that Mosaic law; next, to let Herod know a second knower of his unlawful act, though the baptist were beheaded; last, that his disciples and all good men might learn to expound him in this place, as in all other his precepts, not by the written letter, but by that unerring paraphrase of christian love and charity, which is the sum of all commands, and the perfection.

Ver. 10. "His disciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry."

This verse I add, to leave no objection behind unanswered: for some may think, if this our Saviour's sentence be so fair, as not commanding aught that patience or nature cannot brook, why then did the disciples murmur and say, "it is not good to marry?" I answer, that the disciples had been longer bred up under the pharisaean doctrine, than under that of Christ, and so no marvel though they yet retained the infection of loving old licentious customs; no marvel though they thought it hard they might not for any offence that thoroughly angered them, divorce a wife, as well as put away a servant, since it was but giving her a bill, as they were taught. Secondly, it was no unwonted thing with them not to understand our Saviour in matters far easier. So that be it granted their conceit of this text was the same which is now commonly conceived, according to the usual rate of their capacity then, it will not hurt a better interpretation. But why did not Christ, seeing their error, inform them? for good cause, it was his professed method not to teach them all things at all times, but each thing in due place and season. Christ said, Luke xxii. that "he who had no sword, should sell his garment and buy one:" the disciples took it in a manifest wrong sense, yet our Saviour did not there inform them better. He told them, "it was easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye," than a rich man in at heaven-gate. They were "amazed exceedingly:" he explained himself to mean of those "who trust in riches," Mark x. "They were amazed then out of measure," for so Mark relates it; as if his explaining had increased their amazement in such a plain case, and which concerned so nearly their calling to be informed in. Good reason therefore, if Christ at that time did not stand amplifying, to the thick prejudice and tradition wherein they were, this question of more difficulty, and less concernment to any perhaps of them in particular. Yet did he not omit to sow within them the seeds of a sufficient determining, against the time that his promised spirit should bring all things to their memory. He had declared in their hearing not long before, how distant he was from abolishing the law itself of divorce; he had referred them to the institution; and after all this, gives them a set answer, from which they might collect what was clear enough, that "all men cannot receive all sayings," ver. 11. If such regard be had to each man's receiving of marriage or single life, what can arise, that the same christian regard should not be had in most necessary divorce? All which instructed both them and us, that it beseemed his disciples to learn the deciding of this question, which hath nothing new in it, first by the institution, then by the general grounds of religion, not by a particular saying here and there, tempered and levelled only to an incident occasion, the riddance of a tempting assault. For what can this be but weak and shallow apprehension, to forsake the standard principles of institution, faith, and charity; then to be blank and various at every occurrence in scripture, and in a cold Spasm of scruple, to rear peculiar doctrines upon the place, that shall bid the gray authority of most unchangeable and sovereign rules to stand by and be contradicted? Thus to this evangelic precept of famous difficulty, which for these many ages weakly understood, and violently put in practice, hath made a shambles rather than an ordinance of matrimony, I am firm a truer exposition cannot be given. If this or that argument here used, please not every one, there is no scarcity of arguments, any half of them will suffice. Or should they all fail, as truth itself can fail as soon, I should content me with the institution alone to wage this controversy, and not distrust to evince. If any need it not, the happier; yet christians ought to study earnestly what may be another's need. But if, as mortal mischances are, some hap to need it, let them be sure they abuse not, and give God his thanks, who hath revived this remedy, not too late for them, and scowled off an inveterate misexposition from the gospel: a work not to perish by the vain breath or doom of this age. Our next industry shall be, under the

same guidance, to try with what fidelity that remaining passage in the Epistles touching this matter, hath been commented.

1 Cor. vii. 10, &c.

10. "And unto the married I command, &c."

11. "And let not the husband put away his wife."

THIS intimates but what our Saviour taught before, that divorce is not rashly to be made, but reconcilment to be perswaded and endeavoured, as oft as the cause can have to do with reconcilment, and is not under the dominion of blameless nature; which may have reason to depart, though seldomest and last from charitable love, yet sometimes from friendly, and familiar, and something oftner from conjugal love, which requires not only moral, but natural causes to the making and maintaining; and may be warrantably excused to retire from the deception of what it justly seeks, and the ill requitals which unjustly it finds. For nature hath her Zodiac also, keeps her great annual circuit over human things, as truly as the sun and planets in the firmament; hath her anomalies, hath her obliquities in ascensions and declinations, accesses and recesses, as blamelessly as they in heaven. And sitting in her planetary orb with two reins in each hand, one strait, the other loose, tempers the course of minds as well as bodies to several conjunctions and oppositions, friendly or unfriendly aspects, consenting ofttest with reason, but never contrary. This in the effect no man of meanest reach but daily sees; and though to every one it appear not in the cause, yet to a clear capacity, well nurtured with good reading and observation, it cannot but be plain and visible. Other exposition therefore than hath been given to former places that give light to these two summary verses, will not be needful: save only that these precepts are meant to those married who differ not in religion.

"But to the rest speak I, not the Lord; if any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away."

Now follows what is to be done, if the persons wedded be of a different faith. The common belief is, that a christian is here commanded not to divorce, if the infidel please to stay, though it be but to vex, or to deride, or to seduce the christian. This doctrine will be the easy work of a refutation. The other opinion is, that a christian is here conditionally permitted to hold wedlock with a misbeliever only, upon hopes limited by christian prudence, which without much difficulty shall be defended. That this here spoken by Paul, not by the Lord, cannot be a command, these reasons avouch. First, the law of Moses, Exod. xxxiv. 16. Deut. vii. 3, 6. interpreted by Ezra and Nehemiah, two infallible authors, commands to divorce an infidel not for the fear only of a ceremonious defilement, but of an irreligious seducement, feared both in respect of the believer himself, and of his children in danger to be perverted by the misbelieving parent, Nehem. xiii. 24, 26. And Peter Martyr thought this a convincing reason. If therefore the legal pollution vanishing, have abrogated the ceremony of this law, so that a christian may be permitted to retain an infidel without uncleanness, yet the moral reason of divorcing stands to eternity, which neither apostle nor angel from heaven can countermand. All that they reply to this, is their human warrant, that God will preserve us in our obedience to this command against the danger of seducement. And so undoubtedly he will, if we understand his commands aright; if we turn not this evangelic permission into a legal, and yet illegal command; if we turn not hope into bondage, the charitable and free hope of gaining another, into the forced and servile temptation of losing our selves: but more of this beneath. Thus these words of Paul by common doctrine made a command, are made a contradiction to the moral law.

Secondly, Not the law only, but the gospel from the law, and from itself, requires even in the same chapter, where divorce between them of one religion is so narrowly forbid,

bid, rather than our christian love should come into danger of backsliding, to forsake all relations how near soever, and the wife expressly, with promise of a high reward, Mat. xix. And he who hates not father or mother, wife or children, hindering his christian course, much more if they despise or assault it, cannot be a disciple, Luke xiv. How can the apostle then command us to love and continue in that matrimony, which our Saviour bids us hate, and forsake? They can as soon teach our faculty of respiration to contract and to dilate itself at once, to breathe and to fetch breath in the same instant, as teach our minds how to do such contrary acts as these towards the same object, and as they must be done in the same moment. For either the hatred of her religion, and her hatred to our religion will work powerfully against the love of her society, or the love of that will by degrees flatter out all our zealous hatred and forsaking, and soon ensnare us to unchristianly compliances.

Thirdly, In marriage there ought not only to be a civil love, but such a love as Christ loves his church; but where the religion is contrary without hope of conversion, there can be no love, no faith, no peaceful society, (they of the other opinion confess it) nay there ought not to be, further than in expectation of gaining a soul; when that ceases, we know God hath put an enmity between the seed of the woman, and the seed of the serpent. Neither should we "love them that hate the Lord," as the prophet told Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron. xix. And this apostle himself in another place warns us that we be not unequally yoked with infidels," 2 Cor. vi. for that there can be no fellowship, no communion, no concord between such. Outward commerce and civil intercourse cannot perhaps be avoided; but true friendship and familiarity there can be none. How vainly therefore, not to say how impiously would the most inward and dear alliance of marriage or continuance in marriage be commanded, where true friendship is confessed impossible? For say they, we are forbid here to marry with an infidel, not bid to divorce. But to rob the words thus of their full sense, will not be allowed them: it is not said, enter not into yoke, but "be not unequally yoked;" which plainly forbids the thing in present act, as well as in purpose: and his manifest conclusion is, not only that "we should not touch," but that having touched, "we should come out from among them, and be separate;" with the promise of a blessing thereupon, that "God will receive us, will be our father, and we his sons and daughters," ver. 17, 18. Why we should stay with an infidel after the expence of all our hopes, can be but for a civil relation; but why we should depart from a seducer, setting aside the misconstruction of this place, is from a religious necessity of departing. The worse cause therefore of staying (if it be any cause at all, for civil government forces it not) must not overtop the religious cause of separating, executed with such an urgent zeal, and such a prostrate humiliation by Ezra and Nehemiah. What God hates to join, certainly he cannot love should continue joined: it being all one in matter of ill consequence, to marry, or to continue married with an infidel, save only so long as we wait willingly, and with a safe hope. St. Paul therefore citing here a command of the Lord Almighty, for so he terms it, that we should separate, cannot have bound us with that which he calls his own, whether command or counsel, that we should not separate.

Which is the fourth reason, for he himself takes care lest we should mistake him, "but to the rest speak I, not the Lord." If the Lord spake not, then man spake it, and man hath no lordship to command the conscience: yet modern interpreters will have it a command, maugre St. Paul himself, they will make him a prophet like Caiaphas, to speak the word of the Lord, not thinking, nay denying to think; though he disavow to have received it from the Lord, his word shall not be taken; though an apostle, he shall be borne down in his own epistle, by a race of expositors who presume to know from whom he spake, better than he himself. Paul deposes that the Lord speaks not this; they, that the Lord speaks it: can this be less than to brave him with a full-faced contradiction? Certainly to such a violence as this, for I cannot call it an expounding, what a man should answer I know not, unless that if it be their pleasure next to put a gag into the apostle's mouth, they are already furnished with a commodious audacity toward the attempt. Beza would seem to shun the contradictory, by telling us that the Lord spake it not in person,

person, as he did the former precept. But how many other doctrines doth St. Paul deliver, which the Lord spake not in person, and yet never uses this preamble but in things indifferent? So long as we receive him for a messenger of God, for him to stand sorting sentences, what the Lord spake in person, and what he, not the Lord in person, would be but a chill trifling, and his readers might catch an ague the while. But if we shall supply the grammatical Ellipsis regularly, and as we must in the same tense, all will be then clear, for we cannot supply it thus, to the rest I speak, the Lord spake not; but I speak, the Lord speaks not. If then the Lord neither spake in person, nor speaks it now, the apostle testifying both, it follows duly, that this can be no command. Forsooth the fear is, lest this not being a command, would prove an evangelic counsel, and so make way for supererogations. As if the apostle could not speak his mind in things indifferent, as he doth in four or five several places of this chapter with the like preface of not commanding, but that the doubted inconvenience of supererogating must needs rush in. And how adds it to the word of the Lord, (for this also they object) whenas the apostle by his christian prudence guides us in the liberty which God hath left us to, without command? Could not the spirit of God instruct us by him what was free, as well as what was not? But what need I more, when Cameron an ingenuous writer, and in high esteem, solidly confutes the surmise of a command here, and among other words hath these; that "when Paul speaks as an apostle, he uses this form," The Lord saith, not I, ver. 10. "but as a private man he saith, I speak, not the Lord." And thus also all the prime fathers, Austin, Jerom, and the rest understood this place.

Fifthly, The very stating of the question declares this to be no command; "If any brother hath an unbelieving wife, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away." For the Greek word *συνευδονει* does not imply only her being pleased to stay, but his being pleased to let her stay; it must be a consent of them both. Nor can the force of this word be rendered less, without either much negligence or iniquity of him that otherwise translates it. And thus the Greek church also and their synods understood it, who best knew what their own language meant, as appears by Matthæus Monachus, an author set forth by Leunclavius, and of antiquity perhaps not inferior to Balsamon, who writes upon the canons of the apostles: this author in his chap. "That marriage is not to be made with heretics," thus recites the second canon of the 6th Synod: "As to the Corinthians, Paul determines; If the believing wife chuse to live with the unbelieving husband, or the believing husband with the unbelieving wife. Mark, saith he, how the apostle here condescends, if the believer please to dwell with the unbeliever; so that if he please not, out of doubt the marriage is dissolved. And I am persuaded it was so in the beginning, and thus preached." And thereupon gives an example of one, who though not deserted, yet by the decree of Theodotus the patriarch, divorced an unbelieving wife. What therefore depends in the plain state of this question on the consent and well liking of them both, must not be a command. Lay next the latter end of the 11th verse to the 12th (for wherefore else is logic taught us?) in a discreet axiom, as it can be no other by the phrase; "The Lord saith, Let not the husband put away his wife: but I say, Let him not put away a misbelieving wife." This sounds as if by the judgment of Paul, a man might put away any wife but the misbelieving; or else the parts are not discrete, or dissentany, for both conclude not putting away, and consequently in such a form the proposition is ridiculous. Of necessity therefore the former part of this sentence must be conceived, as understood, and silently granted, that although the Lord command to divorce an infidel, yet I, not the Lord command you? No, but give my judgment, that for some evangelic reasons a christian may be permitted not to divorce her. Thus while we reduce the brevity of St. Paul to a plainer sense, by the needful supply of that which was granted between him and the Corinthians, the very logic of his speech extracts him confessing that the Lord's command lay in a seeming contrariety to this his counsel: and that he meant not to thrust out a command of the Lord by a new one of his own, as one nail drives another, but to release us from the rigour of it, by the right of the gospel, so far forth as a charitable cause leads us

in the hope of winning another soul without the peril of losing our own. For this is the glory of the gospel, to teach us that 'the end of the commandment is charity,' 1 Tim. i. not the drudging out a poor and worthless duty forced from us by the tax and tale of so many letters. This doctrine therefore can be no command, but it must contradict the moral law, the gospel, and the Apostle himself, both elsewhere and here also even in the act of speaking.

If then it be no command, it must remain to be a permission, and that not absolute, for so it would be still contrary to the law, but with such a caution as breaks not the law, but as the manner of the gospel is, fulfils it through charity. The law had two reasons, the one was ceremonial, the pollution that all Gentiles were to the Jews; this the vision of Peter had abolished, Acts x. and cleansed all creatures to the use of a christian. The Corinthians understood not this, but feared lest dwelling in matrimony with an unbeliever, they were defiled. The Apostle discusses that scruple with an evangelic reason, shewing them that although God heretofore under the law, not intending the conversion of the Gentiles, except some special ones, held them as polluted things to the Jew, yet now purposing to call them in, he hath purified them from that legal uncleanness wherein they stood, to use and to be used in a pure manner.

For faith he, "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband, else were your children unclean; but now they are holy." That is, they are sanctified to you, from that legal impurity which you so fear; and are brought into a near capacity to be holy, if they believe, and to have free access to holy things. In the mean time, as being God's creatures, a christian hath power to use them according to their proper use; in as much as now, "all things to the pure are become pure." In this legal respect therefore ye need not doubt to continue in marriage with an unbeliever. Thus others also expound this place, and Cameron especially. This reason warrants us only what we may do without fear of pollution, does not bind us that we must. But the other reason of the law to divorce an infidel was moral, the avoiding of enticement from the true faith. This cannot shrink; but remains in as full force as ever, to save the actual christian from the snare of a misbeliever. Yet if a christian full of grace and spiritual gifts, finding the misbeliever not frowardly affected, fears not a seducing, but hopes rather a gaining, who sees not that this moral reason is not violated by not divorcing, which the law commanded to do, but better fulfilled by the excellence of the gospel working through charity? For neither the faithful is seduced, and the unfaithful is either saved, or with all discharge of love and evangelic duty, sought to be saved. But contrary-wise if the infirm christian shall be commanded here against his mind, against his hope, and against his strength, to dwell with all the scandals, the household persecutions, or alluring temptations of an infidel, how is not the gospel by this made harsher than the law, and more yoking? Therefore the Apostle ere he deliver this other reason why we need not in all haste put away an infidel, his mind misgiving him, lest he should seem to be the imposer of a new command; stays not for method, but with an abrupt speed inserts the declaration of their liberty in this matter.

"But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart; a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases: but God hath called us to peace."

But if the unbelieving depart." This cannot be restrained to local departure only; for who knows not that an offensive society is worse than a forsaking. If his purpose of cohabitation be to endanger the life, or the conscience, Beza himself is half persuaded, that this may purchase to the faithful person the same freedom that a desertion may; and so Gerard and others whom he cites. If therefore he depart in affection; if he depart from giving hope of his conversion; if he disturb, or scoff at religion, seduce, or tempt; if he rage, doubtless not the weak only, but the strong may leave him: if not for fear, yet for the dignity's sake of religion, which cannot be liable to all base affronts, merely for the worshipping of a civil marriage. I take therefore "departing" to be as large as the

the negative of being well pleased: that is, if he be not pleased for the present to live lovingly, quietly, inoffensively, so as may give good hope; which appears well by that which follows.

“A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases.”] If St. Paul provide seriously against the bondage of a christian, it is not the only bondage to live unmarried for a deserting infidel, but to endure his presence intolerably, to bear indignities against his religion in words or deeds, to be wearied with seducements, to have idolatries and superstitions ever before his eyes, to be tormented with impure and prophane conversation; this must needs be bondage to a christian: is this left all unprovided for, without remedy, or freedom granted? Undoubtedly no; for the Apostle leaves it further to be considered with prudence, what bondage a brother or sister is not under, not only in this case, but as he speaks himself plurally, “in such cases.”

“But God hath called us to peace.”] To peace, not to bondage, not to brabbles and contentions with him who is not pleased to live peaceably, as marriage and christianity require. And where strife arises from a cause hopeless to be allayed, what better way to peace than by separating that which is ill joined? It is not divorce that first breaks the peace of a family, as some fondly comment on this place, but it is peace already broken, which, when other cures fail, can only be restored to the faultless person by a necessary divorce. And St. Paul here warrants us to seek peace, rather than to remain in bondage. If God hath called us to peace, why should we not follow him? why should we miserably stay in perpetual discord under a servitude not required?

“For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband,” &c.] St. Paul having thus cleared himself, not to go about the mining of our christian liberty, not to cast a snare upon us, which to do he so much hated, returns now to the second reason of that law, to put away an infidel for fear of seducement, which he does not here contradict with a command now to venture that; but if neither the infirmity of the christian, nor the strength of the unbeliever be feared, but hopes appearing that he may be won, he judges it no breaking of that law, though the believer be permitted to forbear divorce, and can abide, without the peril of seducement, to offer the charity of a salvation to wife or husband, which is the fulfilling, not the transgressing of that law; and well worth the undertaking with much hazard and patience. For what knowest thou whether thou shalt save thy wife, that is, till all means convenient and possible with discretion and probability, as human things are, have been used. For Christ himself sends not our hope on pilgrimage to the world's end; but sets it bounds, beyond which we need not wait on a brother, much less on an infidel. If after such a time we may count a professing christian no better than a Heathen, after less time perhaps we may cease to hope of a heathen, that he will turn christian. Otherwise, to bind us harder than the law, and tell us we are not under bondage, is mere mockery. If till the unbeliever please to part, we may not stir from the house of our bondage, then certain this our liberty is not grounded in the purchase of Christ, but in the pleasure of a miscreant. What knows the loyal husband, whether he may not save the adulteress? he is not therefore bound to receive her. What knows the wife, but she may reclaim her husband who hath deserted her? Yet the reformed churches do not enjoin her to wait longer than after the contempt of an ecclesiastical summons. Beza himself here befriends us with a remarkable speech, “What could be firmly constituted in human matters, if under pretence of expecting grace from above, it should be never lawful for us to seek our right?” And yet in other cases not less reasonable to obtain a most just and needful remedy by divorce, he turns the innocent party to a task of prayers beyond the multitude of beads and rosaries, to beg the gift of chastity in recompence of an injurious marriage. But the Apostle is evident enough, “we are not under bondage;” trusting that he writes to those who are not ignorant what bondage is, to let supercilious determiners cheat them of their freedom.

God

God hath called us to peace, and so doubtless hath left in our hands how to obtain it seasonably ; if it be not our own choice to sit ever like novices wretchedly servile.

Thus much the Apostle in this question between christian and pagan, to us now of little use ; yet supposing it written for our instruction, as it may be rightly applied, I doubt not but that the difference between a true believer and a heretic, or any one truly religious either deserted or seeking divorce from any one grossly erroneous or prophane, may be referred hither. For St. Paul leaves us here the solution not of this case only, which little concerns us, but of such like cases, which may occur to us. For where the reasons directly square, who can forbid why the verdict should not be the same ? But this the common writers allow us not. And yet from this text, which in plain words give liberty to none, unless deserted by an infidel, they collect the same freedom, though the desertion be not for religion, which, as I conceive, they need not do ; but may, without straining, reduce it to the cause of fornication. For first, they confess that desertion is seldom without a just suspicion of adultery : next, it is a breach of marriage in the same kind, and in some sort worse : for adultery, though it give to another, yet it bereaves not all ; but the deserter wholly denies all right, and makes one flesh twain, which is counted the absolute breach of matrimony, and causes the other, as much as in him lies, to commit sin, by being so left. Nevertheless, those reasons which they bring of establishing by this place the like liberty from any desertion, are fair and solid : and if the thing be lawful, and can be proved so, more ways than one, so much the safer. Their arguments I shall here recite, and that they may not come idle, shall use them to make good the like freedom to divorce for other causes ; and that we are no more under bondage to any heinous default against the main ends of matrimony, than to a desertion : First they alledge that to 1 Tim. v. 8. “ If any provide not for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.” But a deserter, say they, “ can have no care of them who are most his own ; therefore the deserted party is not less to be righted against such a one, than against an infidel.” With the same evidence I argue, that man or wife who hates in wedlock, is perpetually unfociable, unpeaceful, or undutious, either not being able, or not willing to perform what the main ends of marriage demand in help and solace, cannot be said to care for who should be dearest in the house ; therefore is worse than an infidel in both regards, either in undertaking a duty which he cannot perform, to the undeserved and unspeakable injury of the other party so defrauded and betrayed, or not performing what he hath undertaken, whenas he may or might have, to the perjury of himself, more irreligious than heathenism. The blameless person therefore hath as good a plea to sue out his delivery from this bondage, as from the desertion of an infidel. Since most writers cannot but grant that desertion is not only a local absence, but an intolerable society ; or if they grant it not, the reasons of St. Paul grant it, with as much leave as they grant to enlarge a particular freedom from paganism, into a general freedom from any desertion. Secondly, they reason from the likeness of either fact, ‘ the same loss redounds to the deserted by a christian, as by an infidel, the same peril of temptation.’ And I in like manner affirm, that if honest and free persons may be allowed to know what is most to their own loss, the same loss and discontent, but worse disquiet, with continual misery and temptation, resides in the company, or better called the persecution of an unfit, or an unpeaceable consort, than by his desertion. For then the deserted may enjoy himself at least. And he who deserts is more favourable to the party whom his presence afflicts, than that importunate thing which is and will be ever conversant before the eyes, a loyal and individual vexation. As for those who still rudely urge it no loss to marriage, no desertion, so long as the flesh is present, and offers a benevolence that hates, or is justly hated ; I am not of that vulgar and low persuasion, to think such forced embracements as these worth the honour, or the humanity of marriage, but far beneath the soul of a rational and free-born man. Thirdly, they say ‘ It is not the infidelity of the deserter, but the desertion of the infidel, from which the Apostle gives this freedom ;’ and I join,

that the apostle could as little require our subjection to an unfit and injurious bondage present, as to an infidel absent. To free us from that which is an evil by being distant, and not from that which is an inmate, and in the bosom evil, argues an improvident and careless deliverer. And thus all occasions, which way soever they turn, are not unofficious to administer something which may conduce to explain, or to defend the assertion of this book touching divorce. I complain of nothing, but that it is indeed too copious to be the matter of a dispute, or a defence, rather to be yielded, as in the best ages, a thing of common reason, not of controversy. What have I left to say? I fear to be more elaborate in such a perspicuity as this; lest I should seem not to teach, but to upbraid the dulness of an age; not to commune with reason in men, but to deplore the loss of reason from among men: this only, and not the want of more to say, is the limit of my discourse.

Who among the Fathers have interpreted the words of Christ concerning divorce, as is here interpreted; and what the civil law of christian emperors in the primitive church determined.

Although testimony be in logic an argument rightly called "inartificial," and doth not solidly fetch the truth by multiplicity of authors, nor argue a thing false by the few that hold so; yet seeing most men from their youth so accustom, as not to scan reason, nor clearly to apprehend it, but to trust for that the names and numbers of such, as have got, and many times undeservedly, the reputation among them to know much; and because there is a vulgar also of teachers, who are as blindly by whom they fancy led, as they lead the people, it will not be amiss for them who had rather list themselves under this weaker sort, and follow authorities, to take notice that this opinion which I bring, hath been favoured, and by some of those affirmed, who in their time were able to carry what they taught, had they urged it, through all Christendom; or to have left it such a credit with all good men, as they who could not boldly use the opinion, would have feared to censure it. But since by his appointment on whom the times and seasons wait, every point of doctrine is not fatal to be thoroughly sifted out in every age; it will be enough for me to find, that the thoughts of wisest heads heretofore, and hearts no less revered for devotion have tended this way, and contributed their lot in some good measure towards this which hath been here attained. Others of them, and modern especially, have been as full in the assertion, though not so full in the reason; so that either in this regard, or in the former, I shall be manifest in a middle fortune to meet the praise or dispraise of being something first.

But I defer not what I undertook to shew, that in the church both primitive and reformed, the words of Christ have been understood to grant divorce for other causes than adultery; and that the word Fornication in marriage hath a larger sense than that commonly supposed.

Justin Martyr in his first apology, written within fifty years after St. John died, relates a story which Eusebius transcribes, that a certain matron of Rome, the wife of a vicious husband, herself also formerly vicious, but converted to the faith, and persuading the same to her husband, at least the amendment of his wicked life; upon his not yielding to her daily entreaties and persuasions in this behalf, procured by law to be divorced from him. This was neither for adultery, nor desertion, but as the relation says, "esteeming it an ungodly thing to be the consort of bed with him, who against the law of nature and of right sought out voluptuous ways." Suppose he endeavoured some unnatural abuse, as the Greek admits that meaning, it cannot yet be called adultery; it therefore could be thought worthy of divorce no otherwise than as equivalent, or worse; and other vices will appear in other respects as much divorcive. Next, it is said her friends advised her to stay a while; and what reason gave they? not because they held

held unlawful what she purposed, but because they thought she might longer yet hope his repentance. She obeyed, till the man going to Alexandria, and from thence reported to grow still more impenitent, not for any adultery or desertion, whereof neither can be gathered, but faith the Martyr, and speaks it like one approving, 'left she should be partaker of his unrighteous and ungodly deeds, remaining in wedlock, the communion of bed and board with such a person, she left him by a lawful divorce. This cannot but give us the judgment of the church in those pure and next to apostolic times. For how else could the woman have been permitted, or here not reprehended? and if a wife might then do this without reproof, a husband certainly might no less, if not more.

Tertullian in the same age, writing his fourth Book against Marcion, witnesses "that Christ by his answer to the Pharisees, protected the constitution of Moses as his own, and directed the institution of the Creator," for I alter not his Carthaginian phrase; "he excused rather than destroyed the constitution of Moses; I say, he forbid conditionally, if any one therefore put away, that he may marry another: so that if he prohibited conditionally, then not wholly; and what he forbade not wholly, he permitted otherwise, where the cause ceases for which he prohibited:" that is, when a man makes it not the cause of his putting away, merely that he may marry again." Christ teaches not contrary to Moses, the justice of divorce hath Christ the asserter: he would not have marriage separate, nor kept with ignominy, permitting then a divorce;" and guesses that this vehemence of our Saviour's sentence was chiefly bent against Herod, as was cited before. Which leaves it evident how Tertullian interpreted this prohibition of our Saviour: for whereas the text is, 'Whosoever putteth away, and marrieth another;' wherefore should Tertullian explain it, "Whosoever putteth away that he may marry another," but to signify his opinion, that our Saviour did not forbid divorce from an unworthy yoke, but forbid the malice or the lust of a needless change, and chiefly those plotted divorces then in use?

Origen in the next century testifies to have known certain who had the government of Churches in his time, who permitted some to marry, while yet their former husbands lived, and excuses the deed, as done "not without cause, though without scripture," which confirms that cause not to be adultery; for how then was it against scripture that they married again? And a little beneath, for I cite his seventh homily on Matthew, faith he, "To endure faults worse than adultery and fornication, seems a thing unreasonable;" and disputes therefore that Christ did not speak by "way of precept, but as it were expounding." By which and the like speeches, Origen declares his mind, far from thinking that our Saviour confined all the causes of divorce to actual adultery.

Lactantius of the age that succeeded, speaking of this matter in the 6th of his 'Institutions,' hath these words: "But lest any think he may circumscribe divine precepts, let this be added, that all misinterpreting, and occasion of fraud or death may be removed, he commits adultery who marries the divorced wife; and, besides the crime of adultery, divorces a wife that he may marry another." To divorce and marry another, and to divorce that he may marry another, are two different things; and imply that Lactantius thought not this place the forbidding of all necessary divorce, but such only as proceeded from the wanton desire of a future choice, not from the burden of a present affliction.

About this time the council of Eliberis in Spain decreed the husband excommunicate, "if he kept his wife being an adulteress; but if he left her, he might after ten years be received into communion, if he retained her any while in his house after the adultery known." The council of Neocæsaria in the year 314, decreed, That if the wife of any Laic were convicted of adultery, that man could not be admitted into the ministry: if after ordination it were committed, he was to divorce her; if not, he could not hold his ministry. The council of Nantes condemned in seven years penance the husband that

would reconcile with an adulteress. But how proves this that other causes may divorce? It proves thus: There can be but two causes why these councils enjoined so strictly the divorcing of an adulteress, either as an offender against God, or against the husband; in the latter respect they could not impose on him to divorce; for every man is the master of his own forgiveness; who shall hinder him to pardon the injuries done against himself? It follows therefore, that the divorce of an adulteress was commanded by these three councils, as it was a sin against God; and by all consequence they could not but believe that other sins as heinous might with equal justice be the ground of a divorce.

Basil in his 73d rule, as Chamier numbers it, thus determines; "That divorce ought not to be, unless for adultery, or the hindrance to a godly life." What doth this but proclaim aloud more causes of divorce than adultery, if by other sins besides this, in wife or husband, the godliness of the better person may be certainly hindered and endangered?

Epiphanius no less ancient, writing against heretics, and therefore should himself be orthodoxal above others, acquaints us in his second book, Tom. i. not that his private persuasion was, but that the whole church in his time generally thought other causes of divorce lawful besides adultery, as comprehended under that name: "If" saith he, "a divorce happen for any cause, either fornication, or adultery, or any heinous fault, the word of God blames not either the man or wife marrying again, nor cuts them off from the congregation, or from life, but bears with the infirmity; not that he may keep both wives, but that leaving the former he may be lawfully joined to the latter: the holy word, and the holy church of God commiserates this man, especially if he be otherwise of good conversation, and live according to God's law." This place is clearer than exposition, and needs no comment.

Ambrose on the 16th of Luke, teaches "that all wedlock is not God's joining": and to the sixteenth of Prov. That a "wife is prepared of the Lord," as the old Latin translates it, he answers, that the Septuagint renders it, "a wife is fitted by the Lord, and tempered to a kind of harmony; and where that harmony is, there God joins; where it is not, there dissension reigns, which is not from God, for God is love." This he brings to prove the marrying of Christian with Gentile to be no marriage, and consequently divorced without sin: but he who sees not this argument how plainly it serves to divorce any untunable, or unatunable matrimony, sees little. On the first to the Cor. vii. he grants a woman may leave her husband not for only fornication, "but for apostacy, and inverting nature, though not marry again; but the man may:" here are causes of divorce assigned other than adultery. And going on, he affirms, "that the cause of God is greater than the cause of matrimony; that the reverence of wedlock is not due to him who hates the author thereof; that no matrimony is firm without devotion to God; that dishonour done to God acquits the other being deserted from the bond of matrimony; that the faith of marriage is not to be kept with such." If these contorted sentences be aught worth, it is not the desertion that breaks what is broken, but the impiety; and who then may not for that cause better divorce, than tarry to be deserted? or these grave sayings of St. Ambrose are but knacks.

Jerom on the 19th of Matthew explains, that for the cause of fornication, or the "suspicion thereof, a man may freely divorce." What can breed that suspicion, but sundry faults leading that way? By Jerom's consent therefore divorce is free not only for actual adultery, but for any cause that may incline a wise man to the just suspicion thereof.

Austin also must be remembered among those who hold that this instance of fornication gives equal inference to other faults equally hateful, for which to divorce: and therefore in his books to Pollentius he disputes "that Infidelity, as being a greater sin than adultery, ought so much the rather cause a divorce." And on the Sermon on the mount, under the name of fornication will have "idolatry, or any harmful superstition" contained,

which are not thought to disturb matrimony so directly as some other obstinacies and disaffections, more against the daily duties of that covenant, and in the Eastern tongues not unfrequently called fornication, as hath been shewn. "Hence is understood," saith he, "that not only for bodily fornication, but for that which draws the mind from God's law, and foully corrupts it, a man may without fault put away his wife, and a wife her husband; because the Lord excepts the cause of fornication, which fornication we are constrained to interpret in a general sense." And in the first book of his "Retractions," chap. 16. he retracts not this his opinion, but commends it to serious consideration; and explains that he counted not there all sin to be fornication, but the more detestable sort of sins. The cause of fornication therefore is not in this discourse newly interpreted to signify other faults infringing the duties of wedlock, besides adultery.

Lastly, the council of Agatha in the year 506, Can. 25. decreed, that "if laymen who divorced without some great fault, or giving no probable cause, therefore divorced, that they might marry some unlawful person, or some other man's, if before the provincial bishops were made acquainted, or judgment past, they presumed this, Excommunication was the penalty." Whence it follows, that if the cause of divorce were some great offence, or that they gave probable causes for what they did, and did not therefore divorce that they might presume with some unlawful person, or what was another man's, the censure of church in those days did not touch them.

Thus having alledged enough to shew, after what manner the primitive church for above 500 years understood our Saviour's words touching divorce, I shall now, with a labour lest dispersed, and sooner dispatched, bring under view what the civil law of those times constituted about this matter: I say the civil law, which is the honour of every true civilian to stand for, rather than to count that for law, which the Pontifical canon had enthralled them to, and instead of interpreting a generous and elegant law, made them the drudges of a blockish Rubric.

Theodosius and Valentinian, pious emperors both, ordained that "as by consent lawful marriages were made, so by consent, but not without the bill of divorce, they might be dissolved; and to dissolve was the more difficult, only in favour of the children." We see the wisdom and piety of that age, one of the purest and learnedest since Christ, conceived no hindrance in the words of our Saviour, but that a divorce mutually consented, might be suffered by the law, especially if there were no children, or if there were, careful provision was made. And further saith that law (supposing there wanted the consent of either,) "We design the causes of divorce by this most wholesome law; for as we forbid the dissolving of marriage without just cause, so we desire that a husband or a wife distressed by some adverse necessity, should be freed though by an unhappy, yet a necessary relief." What dram of wisdom or religion (for charity is truest religion) could there be in that knowing age, which is not virtually summed up in this most just law? As for those other Christian emperors, from Constantine the first of them, finding the Roman law in this point so answerable to the Mosaic, it might be the likeliest cause why they altered nothing to restraint; but if aught, rather to liberty, for the help and consideration of the weaker sex, according as the gospel seems to make the wife more equal to her husband in these conjugal respects than the law of Moses doth. Therefore 'if a man were absent from his wife four years, and in that space not heard of, though gone to war in the service of the empire,' she might divorce, and marry another by the edict of Constantine to Dalmatius, Co. l. 5. tit. 17. And this was an age of the church, both ancient and cried up still for the most flourishing in knowledge and pious government since the apostles. But to return to this law of Theodosius, with this observation by the way, that still as the church corrupted, as the clergy grew more ignorant, and yet more usurping on the magistrate, who also now declined, so still divorce grew more restrained; though certainly if better times permitted the thing that worse

times restrained, it would not weakly argue that the permission was better, and the restraint worse. This law therefore of Theodosius, wiser in this than the most of his successors, though not wiser than God and Moses, reduced the causes of divorce to a certain number, which by the judicial law of God, and all recorded humanity, were left before to the breast of each husband, provided that the dismiss was not without reasonable conditions to the wife. But this was a restraint not yet come to extremes. For besides adultery, and that not only actual, but suspected by many signs there set down, any fault equally punishable with adultery, or equally infamous, might be the cause of a divorce. Which informs us how the wisest of those ages understood that place in the gospel, whereby not the pilfering of a benevolence was considered as the main and only breach of wedlock, as is now thought, but the breach of love and peace, a more holy union than that of the flesh; and the dignity of an honest person was regarded, not to be held in bondage with one whose ignominy was infectious. To this purpose was constituted Cod. l. 5. tit. 17. and Authent. collat. 4. tit. i. Novell. 22. where Justinian added three causes more. In the 117 Novell. most of the same causes are allowed, but the liberty of divorcing by consent is repealed: but by whom? by Justinian, not a wiser, not a more religious emperor than either of the former, but noted by judicious writers for his fickle head in making and unmaking laws; and how Procopius, a good historian, and a counsellor of state then living, decyphers him in his other actions, I willingly omit. Nor was the church then in better case, but had the corruption of a hundred declining years swept on it, when the statute of "Consent" was called in; which, as I said, gives us every way more reason to suspect this restraint, more than that liberty: which therefore in the reign of Justin, the succeeding emperor, was recalled, Novell. 140, and established with a preface more wise and christianly than for those times, declaring the necessity to restore that Theodosian law, if no other means of reconciliation could be found. And by whom this law was abrogated, or how long after, I do not find; but that those other causes remained in force as long as the Greek empire subsisted, and were assented to by that church, is to be read in the canons and edicts compared by Photius the patriarch, with the avertiments of Balsamon and Matthæus Monachus thereon.

But long before those days, Leo, the Son of Basilus Macedo, reigning about the year 886, and for his excellent wisdom surnamed the "Philosopher," constituted, "that in case of madness, the husband might divorce after three years, the wife after five. Constitut. Leon. 111, 112." This declares how he expounded our Saviour, and derived his reasons from the institution, which in his preface with great eloquence are set down; whereof a passage or two may give some proof, though better not divided from the rest. "There is not," saith he, "a thing more necessary to preserve mankind, than the help given him from his own rib; both God and nature so teaching us: which being so, it was requisite that the providence of law, or if any other care be to the good of man, should teach and ordain those things which are to the help and comfort of married persons, and confirm the end of marriage purposed in the beginning, not those things which afflict and bring perpetual misery to them." Then answers the objection, that they are one flesh; "If matrimony had held so as God ordained it, he were wicked that would dissolve it. But if we respect this in matrimony, that it be contracted to the good of both, how shall he, who for some great evil feared, persuades not to marry though contracted, not persuade to unmarry, if after marriage a calamity befall? Should we bid beware lest any fall into an evil, and leave him helpless who by human error is fallen therein? This were as if we should use remedies to prevent a disease, but let the sick die without remedy. The rest will be worth reading in the author.

And thus we have the judgment first of primitive fathers; next of the imperial law not disallowed by the universal church in ages of her best authority; and lastly, of the whole Greek church and civil state, incorporating their canons and edicts together, that divorce

divorce was lawful for other causes equivalent to adultery, contained under the word Fornication. So that the exposition of our Saviour's sentence here alledged hath all these ancient and great asserters; is therefore neither new nor licentious, as some would persuade the commonalty: although it be nearer truth that nothing is more new than those teachers themselves, and nothing more licentious than some known to be, whose hypocrisy yet shames not to take offence at this doctrine for licence; whenas indeed they fear it would remove licence, and leave them but few companions.

That the Pope's canon law encroaching upon civil magistracy, abolished all divorce even for adultery. What the reformed divines have recovered; and that the famousst of them have taught according to the assertion of this book.

But in these Western parts of the empire, it will appear almost unquestionable that the cited law of Theodosius and Valentinian stood in force until the blindest and corruptest times of popedom displaced it. For, that the volumes of Justinian never came into Italy, or beyond Illyricum, is the opinion of good antiquaries. And that only manuscript thereof found in Apulia, by Lotharius the Saxon, and given to the states of Pisa, for their aid at sea against the Normans of Sicily, was received as a rarity not to be matched. And although the Goths, and after them the Lombards and Franks, who over-run the most of Europe, except this island, (unless we make our Saxons and Normans a limb of them) brought in their own customs, yet that they followed the Roman laws in their contracts and marriages, Agathias the Historian is alledged. And other testimonies relate that Alaricus and Theodoric their kings, writ their statutes out of this Theodosian Code, which hath the recited law of divorce. Nevertheless, while the monarchs of Christendom were yet barbarous, and but half-christian, the popes took this advantage of their weak superstition, to raise a corpulent law out of the canons and decretals of audacious priests; and presumed also to set this in the front: "That the Constitutions of princes are not above the constitutions of Clergy, but beneath them." Using this very instance of divorce as the first prop of their tyranny; by a false consequence drawn from a passage of Ambrose upon Luke, where he saith, though "Man's law grant it, yet God's law prohibits it: whence Gregory the pope, writing to Theodistia, infers that ecclesiastical courts cannot be dissolved by the magistrate. A fair conclusion from a double error. First, in saying that the divine law prohibited divorce: (for what will he make of Moses?) Next, supposing that it did, how will it follow, that whatever Christ forbids in his evangelic precepts, should be haled into a judicial constraint against the pattern of a divine law? Certainly the gospel came not to enact such compulsions. In the mean while we may note here, that the restraint of divorce was one of the first fair seeming pleas which the Pope had, to step into secular authority, and with his antichristian rigour to abolish the permissive law of Christian Princes conforming to a sacred law-giver. Which if we consider, this papal and unjust restriction of divorce need not be so dear to us, since the plausible restraining of that was in a manner the first loosening of antichrist, and as it were, the substance of his eldest horn. Nor do we less remarkably owe the first means of his fall here in England, to the contemning of that restraint by Henry the VIIIth, whose divorce he opposed. Yet was not that rigour executed anciently in spiritual courts, until Alexander the IIIrd, who trod upon the neck of Frederic Barbarossa the emperor, and summoned our Henry IIrd. into Normandy, about the death of Becket. He it was, that the worthy author may be known, who first actually repealed the imperial law of divorce, and decreed this tyrannous decree, that matrimony for no cause should be dissolved, though for many causes it might separate; as may be seen Decret. Gregor. l. 4. tit. 19. and in other places of the canonical tomes. The main good of which invention, wherein it consists, who can tell? but that it hath one virtue incomparable, to fill all Christendom with whoredoms and adulteries, beyond the art of Balaams, or of devils. Yet
neither

neither can these, though so perverse, but acknowledge that the words of Christ, under the name of fornication, allow putting away for other causes than adultery, both from "Bed and Board," but not from the "Bond"; their only reason is, because marriage they believe to be a "Sacrament." But our divines, who would seem long since to have renounced that reason, have so forgot themselves, as yet to hold the absurdity, which but for that reason, unless there be some mystery of Satan in it, perhaps the papist would not hold. 'Tis true, we grant divorce for actual and proved adultery, and not for less than many tedious and unrepairable years of desertion, wherein a man shall lose all his hope of posterity, which great and holy men have bewailed, ere he can be righted; and then perhaps on the confines of his old age, when all is not worth the while. But grant this were seasonably done; what are these two cases to many other, which afflict the state of marriage as bad, and yet find no redress? What hath the soul of man deserved, if it be in the way of salvation, that it should be mortgaged thus, and may not redeem itself according to conscience, out of the hands of such ignorant and slothful teachers as these, who are neither able nor mindful to give due tendance to that precious cure which they rashly undertake; nor have in them the noble goodness to consider these distresses and accidents of man's life, but are bent rather to fill their mouths with tithe and oblation? Yet if they can learn to follow, as well as they can seek to be followed, I shall direct them to a fair number of renowned men, worthy to be their leaders, who will commend to them a doctrine in this point wiser than their own; and if they be not impatient, it will be the same doctrine which this treatise hath defended.

Wicklef, that Englishman honoured of God to be the first preacher of a general reformation to all Europe, was not in this thing better taught of God, than to teach among his chiefest recoveries of truth, "that divorce is lawful to the Christian for many other causes equal to adultery." This book indeed, through the poverty of our libraries, I am forced to cite from "Arniseus of Halberstad on the Rite of marriage," who cites it from Corasius of Toulouse, c. 4. Cent. Sect. and he from Wicklef, l. 4. Dial. c. 21. So much the sorrier, for that I never looked into an author cited by his adversary upon this occasion, but found him more conducive to the question than his quotation rendered him.

Next, Luther, how great a servant of God! in his book of "conjugal Life" quoted by Gerard out of the Dutch, allows divorce for the obstinate denial of conjugal duty; and "that a man may send away a proud Vashti, and marry an Esther in her stead." It seems, if this example shall not be impertinent, that Luther meant not only the refusal of benevolence, but a stubborn denial of any main conjugal duty; or if he did not, it will be evinced from what he allows. For out of question, with men that are not barbarous, love and peace, and fitness, will be yielded as essential to marriage, as corporal benevolence. "Though I give my body to be burnt, saith St. Paul, and have not charity, it profits me nothing." So though the body prostitute itself to whom the mind affords no other love or peace, but constant malice and vexation, can this bodily benevolence deserve to be called a marriage between Christians and rational Creatures?

Melancton, the third great luminary of reformation, in his book "concerning marriage," grants divorce for cruel usage, and danger of life, urging the authority of that Theodosian law, which he esteems written with the grave deliberation of godly men; "and that they who reject this law, and think it disagreeing from the gospel, understand not the difference of law and gospel; that the magistrate ought not only to defend life, but to succour the weak conscience; lest broke with grief and indignation, it relinquish prayer, and turn to some unlawful thing." What if this heavy plight of despair arise from other discontents in wedlock, which may go to the soul of a good man more than the danger of his life, or cruel using, which a man cannot be liable to? suppose it be ingrateful usage, suppose it be perpetual spight, and disobedience, suppose a hatred; shall not the magistrate free him from this disquiet which interrupts his prayers,

ers, and disturbs the course of his service to God and his country all as much, and brings him such a misery, as that he more desires to leave his life, than fears to lose it? Shall not this equally concern the office of civil protection, and much more the charity of a true church to remedy?

Eraſmus, who for learning was the wonder of his age, both in his Notes on Matthew, and on the first to the Corinthians, in a large and eloquent discourse, and in his answer to Phimoſtomus, a papist, maintains (and no protestant then living contradicted him) that the words of Christ comprehend many other causes of divorce under the name of fornication.

Bucer, (whom our famous Dr. Rainolds was wont to prefer before Calvin) in his comment on Matthew, and in his second book "of the kingdom of Christ," treats of divorce at large, to the same effect as is written in "the Doctrine and Discipline of divorce" lately published, and the translation is extant: whom, lest I should be thought to have wrested to mine own purpose, take something more out of his 49th chapter, which I then for brevity omitted. "It will be the duty of pious princes, and all who govern church or commonwealth, if any, whether husband or wife, shall affirm their want of such who either will, or can tolerably perform the necessary duties of married life, to grant that they may seek them such, and marry them; if they make it appear that such they have not." This book he wrote here in England, where he lived the greatest admired man; and this he dedicated to Edward the VIth.

Fagius, ranked among the famous divines of Germany, whom Frederic, at that time the Palatine, sent for to be the reformer of his dominion, and whom afterwards England sought to, and obtained of him to come and teach her, differs not in this opinion from Bucer, as his notes on the Chaldee Paraphraſt well testify.

The whole Church of Strasburgh in her most flourishing time, when Zellius, Hedio, Capito, and other great divines taught there, and those two renowned magistrates, Farerus and Sturmius governed that commonwealth and academy to the admiration of all Germany, hath thus in the 21st article: "We teach, that if according to the word of God, yea, or against it, divorces happen, to do according to God's word, Deut. xxiv. 1. Mat. xix. 1 Cor. vii. and the observation of the primitive church, and the christian constitution of pious Cæsars."

Peter Martyr seems in word our easy adversary, but is indeed for us: toward which, though it be something when he saith of this opinion, "that it is not wicked, and can hardly be refuted," this which follows is much more; "I speak not here, saith he, of natural impediments, which may so happen, that the matrimony can no longer hold: but adding, that he often wondered, how the ancient and most Christian emperors established those laws of divorce, and neither Ambrose, who had such influence upon the laws of Theodosius, nor any of those holy fathers found fault, nor any of the churches, why the magistrates of this day should be so loth to constitute the same. Perhaps they fear an inundation of divorces, which is not likely; whenas we read not either among the Hebrews, Greeks, or Romans, that they were much frequent where they were most permitted. If they judge christian men, worse than Jews or Pagans, they both injure that name, and by this reason will be constrained to grant divorces the rather; because it was permitted as a remedy of evil, for who would remove the medicine, while the disease is yet so rife?" This being read both in "his common places," and on the first to the Corinthians, with what we shall relate more of him yet ere the end, sets him absolutely on this side. Not to insist that in both these, and other places of his commentaries, he grants divorce not only for desertion, but for the seducement and scandalous demeanour of a heretical consort.

Musculus, a divine of no obscure fame, distinguishes between the religious and the civil determination of divorce; and leaving the civil wholly to the lawyers, pronounces a conscionable divorce for impotence not only natural, but accidental, if it be durable.

His equity, it seems, can enlarge the words of Christ, to one cause more than adultery; why may not the reason of another man as wife, enlarge them to another cause?

Gualter of Zurich, a well-known judicious commentator, in his homilies on Matthew, allows divorce for "Leprosy, or any other cause which renders unfit for wedlock," and calls this rather "a nullity of marriage than a divorce." And who, that is not himself a mere body, can restrain all the unfitness of marriage, only to a corporeal defect?

Hemingius, an author highly esteemed, and his works printed at Geneva, writing of divorce, confesses that learned men "vary in this question, some granting three causes thereof, some five, others many more"; he himself gives us six, Adultery, Desertion, Inability, Error, Evil-usage, and Impiety, using argument that Christ under one special contains the whole kind, and under the name and example of fornication, he includes other causes equipollent." This discourse he wrote at the request of many who had the judging of these causes in Denmark, and Norway, who by all likelihood followed his advice.

Hunnius, a doctor of Wittenberg, well known both in divinity and other arts, on the sixth of Matth. affirms, "That the exception of fornication expressed by our Saviour, excludes not other causes equalling adultery, or destructive to the substantials of matrimony; but was opposed to the custom of the Jews, who made divorce for every light cause."

Felix Bidenbachius, an eminent divine in the dutchy of Wirtemberg, affirms, "That the obstinate refusal of conjugal due, is a lawful cause of divorce; and gives an instance, that the consistory of that state so judged."

Gerard cites Harbardus, an author not unknown, and Arniseus cites Wigandus, both yielding divorce in case of cruel usage; and another author, who testifies to "have seen in a dukedom of Germany, Marriages disjoined for some implacable enmities arising."

Beza, one of the strictest against divorce, denies it not "for danger of life from a heretic, or importunate solicitation to do aught against religion: and counts it "all one whether the heretic desert, or would stay upon intolerable conditions." But this decision well examined, will be found of no solidity. For Beza would be asked why, if God so strictly exact our stay in any kind of wedlock, we had not better stay and hazard a murdering for religion at the hand of a wife or husband, as he and others enjoin us to stay and venture it for all other causes but that? and why a man's life is not as well and warrantably saved by divorcing from an orthodox murderer, as a heretical? Again, if desertion be confessed by him to consist not only in the forsaking, but in the unsufferable conditions of staying, a man may as well deduce the lawfulness of divorcing from any intolerable conditions (if his grant be good, that we may divorce thereupon from a heretic) as he can deduce it lawful to divorce from any deserter, by finding it lawful to divorce from a deserting infidel. For this is plain, if St. Paul's permission to divorce an infidel deserter, infer it lawful for any malicious desertion, then doth Beza's definition of a deserter, transfer itself with like facility from the cause of religion, to the cause of malice, and proves it as good to divorce from him who intolerably stays, as from him who purposely departs; and leaves it as lawful to depart from him who urgently requires a wicked thing, though professing the same religion, as from him who urges a heathenish or superstitious compliance in a different faith. For if there be such necessity of our abiding, we ought rather to abide the utmost for religion, than for any other cause; seeing both the cause of our stay is pretended our religion to marriage, and the cause of our suffering is supposed our constant marriage to religion. Beza therefore, by his own definition of a deserter, justifies a divorce from any wicked or intolerable conditions rather in the same religion than in a different.

Aretius, a famous divine of Bern, approves many causes of divorce in his "Problems," and adds, "that the laws and consistories of Switzerland approve them also. As first, adultery,

adultery, and that not actual only, but intentional; alledging Matthew v. Whosoever looketh to lust, hath committed adultery already in his heart. Whereby, saith he, our Saviour shews that the breach of matrimony may be not only by outward act, but by the heart and desire; when that hath once possessed, it renders the conversation intolerable, and commonly the fact follows." Other causes to the number of nine or ten, consenting in most with the imperial laws, may be read in the author himself, who avers them "to be grave and weighty." All these are men of name in divinity; and to these, if need were, might be added more. Nor have the Civilians been all so blinded by the canon, as not to avouch the justice of those old permissions touching divorce.

Alciat of Milain, a man of extraordinary wisdom and learning, in the sixth book of his "Parerga," defends those imperial laws, "not repugnant to the gospel, as the church then interpreted. For, saith he, the ancients understood him separate by man, whom passions and corrupt affections divorced, not if the provincial bishops first heard the matter, and judged, as the council of Agatha declares:" and on some part of the Code he names Isidorus Hispalensis, the first computer of canons, "to be in the same mind." And in the former place gives his opinion "that divorce might be more lawfully permitted than usury."

Corasius, recorded by Helvicus among the famous lawyers, hath been already cited of the same judgment.

Wesembecius, a much-named Civilian, in his comment on this law defends it, and affirms, "That our Saviour excluded not other faults equal to adultery; and that the word fornication signifies larger among the Hebrews than with us, comprehending every fault which alienates from him to whom obedience is due, and that the primitive church interpreted so."

Grotius, yet living, and of prime note among learned men, retires plainly from the canon to the ancient civility, yea, to the Mosaic law, "as being most just and undeceivable." On the 5th of Matth. he saith, "That Christ made no civil laws, but taught us how to use law: that the law sent not a husband to the judge about this matter of divorce, but left him to his own conscience; that Christ therefore cannot be thought to send him; that adultery may be judged by a vehement suspicion; that the exception of adultery seems an example of other like offences; proves it from the manner of speech, the maxims of law, the reason of charity, and common equity."

These authorities, without long search, I had to produce, all excellent men, some of them such as many ages had brought forth none greater: almost the meanest of them might deserve to obtain credit in a singularity; what might not then all of them joined in an opinion so consonant to reason? For although some speak of this cause, others of that, why divorce may be, yet all agreeing in the necessary enlargement of that textual straitness, leave the matter to equity, not to literal bondage; and so the opinion closes. Nor could I have wanted more testimonies, had the cause needed a more solicitous enquiry. But herein the satisfaction of others hath been studied, not the gaining of more assurance to mine own persuasion: although authorities contributing reason withal, be a good confirmation and a welcome. But God (I solemnly attest him!) withheld from my knowledge the consenting judgment of these men so late, until they could not be my instructors, but only my unexpected witnesses to partial men, that in this work I had not given the worst experiment of an industry joined with integrity, and the free utterance, tho' of an unpopular truth. Which yet to the people of England may, if God so please, prove a memorable informing; certainly a benefit which was intended them long since by men of highest repute for wisdom and piety, Bucer and Erasmus. Only this one authority more, whether in place or out of place, I am not to omit; which if any can think a small one, I must be patient, it is no smaller than the whole assembled authority of England both church and state; and in those times which are on record for the purest and sincerest that ever shone yet on the reformation of this island, the time of Edward the Sixth. That

324 Expositions on the four chief places in Scripture, &c.

worthy prince, having utterly abolished the canon law out of his dominions, as his father did before him, appointed by full vote of parliament, a committee of two and thirty chosen men, divines and lawyers, of whom Cranmer the archbishop, Peter Martyr, and Walter Haddon (not without the assistance of Sir John Cheeke the king's tutor, a man at that time counted the learnedest of Englishmen, and for piety not inferior) were the chief, to frame a-new some ecclesiastical laws that might be instead of what was abrogated. The work with great diligence was finished, and with as great approbation of that reforming age was received; and had been doubtless, as the learned preface thereof testifies, established by act of parliament, had not the good king's death so soon ensuing, arrested the further growth of religion also, from that season to this. Those laws, thus founded on the memorable wisdom and piety of that religious parliament and synod, allow divorce and second marriage, "not only for adultery or desertion, but for any capital enmity or plot laid against the other's life, and likewise for evil and fierce usage:" nay the twelfth chapter of that title by plain consequence declares, "that lesser contentions, if they be perpetual, may obtain divorce:" which is all one really with the position by me held in the former treatise published on this argument, herein only differing, that there the cause of perpetual strife was put for example in the unchangeable discord of some natures; but in these laws intended us by the best of our ancestors, the effect of continual strife is determined no unjust plea of divorce, whether the cause be natural or wilful. Whereby the wariness and deliberation from which that discourse proceeded, will appear, and that God hath aided us to make no bad conclusion of this point; seeing the opinion which of late hath undergone ill censures among the vulgar, hath now proved to have done no violence to scripture, unless all these famous authors alledged have done the like; nor hath affirmed aught more than what indeed the most nominated fathers of the church, both ancient and modern, are unexpectedly found affirming; the laws of God's peculiar people, and of primitive Christendom found to have practised, reformed churches and states to have imitated, and especially the most pious church-times of this kingdom to have framed and published, and but for sad hindrances in the sudden change of religion, had enacted by the parliament. Henceforth let them who condemn the assertion of this book for new and licentious, be sorry; lest, while they think to be of the graver sort, and take on them to be teachers, they expose themselves rather to be pledged up and down by men who intimately know them, to the discovery and contempt of their ignorance and presumption.

COLA-

COLASTERION:

A REPLY to a nameless ANSWER against the Doctrine and Discipline of DIVORCE.

Wherein the trivial author of that Answer is discovered, the licen-
ser conferred with, and the opinion which they traduce, de-
fended.

P R O V. xxvi. 5.

“ Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit.”

AFTER many rumours of confutations and convictions, forth-coming against the Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, and now and then a by-blow from the pulpit, feathered with a censure strict indeed, but how true, more beholden to the authority of that devout place which it borrowed to be uttered in, than to any sound reason which it could oracle; while I still hoped as for a blessing to see some piece of diligence, or learned discretion come from them, it was my hap at length, lighting on a certain parcel of queries, that seek and find not, to find not seeking, at the tail of Anabaptistical, Antinomian, Heretical, Atheistical epithets, a jolly slander, called “Divorce at pleasure.” I stood a-while and wondered, what we might do to a man’s heart, or what anatomy use, to find in it sincerity; for all our wonted marks every day fail us, and where we thought it was, we see it is not, for alter and change residence it cannot sure. And yet I see no good of body or of mind secure to a man for all his past labours, without perpetual watchfulness and perseverance: whenas one above others, who hath suffered much and long in the defence of truth, shall after all this, give her cause to leave him so destitute and so vacant of her defence, as to yield his mouth to be the common road of truth and falshood, and such falshood as is joined with a rash and heedless calumny of his neighbour. For what book hath he ever met with, as his complaint is, “Printed in the City,” maintaining either in the title, or in the whole pursuance, “Divorce at pleasure?” ’Tis true, that to divorce upon extreme necessity, when through the perverseness, or the apparent unfitness of either, the continuance can be to both no good at all, but an intolerable injury and temptation to the wronged and the defrauded; to divorce then, there is a book that writes it lawful. And that this law is a pure and wholesome national law, not to be withheld from good men, because others likely enough may abuse it to their pleasure, cannot be charged upon that book, but must be entred a bold and impious accusation against God himself; who did not for this abuse withhold it from his own people. It will be just therefore, and best for the reputation of him who in his Subitanes hath thus censured, to recall his sentence. And if, out of the abundance of his volumes, and the readiness of his quill, and the vastness of his other employments, especially in the great audit for accounts, he can spare us aught to the better understanding of this point, he shall be thanked in public; and what hath offended in the book, shall willingly submit to his correction. Provided he be sure not to come with those old and stale suppositions, unless he can take away clearly what that discourse hath urged against them, by one who will expect other arguments to be persuaded the good health of a sound answer, than the gout and dropsy of

of a big margent, littered and overlaid with crude and huddled quotations. But as I still was waiting, when these light-armed refuters would have done pelting at their three lines uttered with a sage delivery of no reason, but an impotent and worse than Bonner-like censure, to burn that which provokes them to a fair dispute; at length a book was brought to my hands, entitled, "An Answer to the Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce." Gladly I received it, and very attentively composed myself to read; hoping that now some good man had vouchsafed the pains to instruct me better, than I could yet learn out of all the volumes which for this purpose I had visited. Only this I marvelled, and other men have since, whenas I, in a subject so new to this age, and so hazardous to please, concealed not my name, why this author, defending that part which is so creeded by the people, would conceal his. But ere I could enter three leaves into the pamphlet, (for I defer the peafantly rudeness, which by the licenser's leave I met with afterwards) my satisfaction came in abundantly, that it could be nothing why he durst not name himself, but the guilt of his own wretchedness. For first, not to speak of his abrupt and bald beginning, his very first page notoriously bewrays him an illiterate and arrogant presumer in that which he understands not, bearing us in hand as if he knew both Greek and Hebrew, and is not able to spell it; which had he been, it had been either written as it ought, or scored upon the printer. If it be excused as the carelessness of his deputy, be it known, the learned author himself is inventoried, and summed up to the utmost value of his livery-cloak. Whoever he be, though this to some may seem a slight contest, I shall yet continue to think that man full of other secret injustice, and deceitful pride, who shall offer in public to assume the skill, tho' it be but of a tongue which he hath not, and would catch his readers to believe of his ability, that which is not in him. The Licenser indeed, as his authority now stands, may license much; but if these Greek orthographies were of his licensing, the boys at school might reckon with him at his grammar. Nor did I find this his want of the pretended languages alone, but accompanied with such a low and home spun expression of his Mother-English all along, without joint or frame, as made me, ere I knew further of him, often stop and conclude, that this author could for certain be no other than some mechanic. Nor was the stile flat and rude, and the matter grave and solid, for then there had been pardon; but so shallow and so unwary was that also, as gave sufficiently the character of a gross and sluggish, yet a contentious and over-weening pretender. For first, it behoving him to shew, as he promises, what divorce is, and what the true Doctrine and Discipline thereof, and this being to do by such principles and proofs as are received on both sides, he performs neither of these; but shews it first from the judaical practice, which he himself disallows, and next from the practice of canon law, which the book he would confute utterly rejects, and all laws depending thereon; which this puny clerk calls "the Laws of England," and yet pronounceth them by an ecclesiastical judge: as if that were to be accounted the law of England, which dependeth on the popery of England; or if it were, this parliament he might know hath now damned that judicature. So that whether his meaning were to inform his own party, or to confute his adversary, instead of shewing us the true Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, he shews us nothing but his own contemptible ignorance. For what is the mosaic law to his opinion? And what is the canon, now utterly antiquated, either to that, or to mine? Ye see already what a faithful definer we have him. From such a wind-egg of definition as this, they who expect any of his other arguments to be well hatched, let them enjoy the virtue of their worthy champion. But one thing more I observed, a singular note of his stupidity, and that his trade is not to meddle with books, much less with confutations; whenas the "Doctrine of Divorce" had now a whole year been published the second time, with many arguments added, and the former ones bettered and confirmed, this idle pamphlet comes reeling forth against the first edition only; as may appear to any by the pages quoted: which put me in mind of what by chance I had notice of to this purpose the last summer, as nothing so serious but happens oft-times to be attended with a ridiculous accident: it was then

then told me that the "Doctrine of Divorce" was answered, and the answer half printed against the first edition, not by one, but by a pack of heads; of whom the chief, by circumstance, was intimated to me, and since ratified to be no other, if any can hold laughter, and I am sure none will guess him lower than an actual serving-man. This creature, for the story must on, (and what tho' he be the lowest person of an interlude, he may deserve a canvassing) transplanted himself, and to the improvement of his wages, and your better notice of his capacity, turned solicitor. And having conversed much with a stripling divine or two of those newly-fledged probationers, that usually come scouting from the university, and lie here no lame legers to pop into the Bethesda of some knight's chaplainship, where they bring grace to his good cheer, but no peace or benediction else to his house; these made the cham-party, he contributed the law, and both joined in the divinity. Which made me intend, following the advice also of friends, to lay aside the thought of mispending a reply to the buz of such a drone's nest. But finding that it lay, whatever was the matter, half a year after unfinished in the press, and hearing for certain that a divine of note, out of his good-will to the opinion, had taken it into his revise, and something had put out, something put in, and stuck it here and there with a clove of his own calligraphy, to keep it from tainting: and farther, when I saw the stuff, though very coarse and threadbare, garnished and trimly faced with the commendations of a licenser, I resolved, so soon as leisure granted me the recreation, that my man of law should not altogether lose his soliciting. Although I impute a share of the making to him whose name I find in the approbation, who may take, as his mind serves him, this reply. In the mean while it shall be seen, I refuse no occasion, and avoid no adversary, either to maintain what I have begun, or to give it up for better reason.

To begin then with the licenser and his censure. For a licenser is not contented now to give his single Imprimatur, but brings his chair into the title-leaf; there sits and judges up, or judges down what book he pleases: if this be suffered, what worthless author, or what cunning printer will not be ambitious of such a stale to put off the heaviest gear; which may in time bring in round fees to the licenser, and wretched misleading to the people? But to the matter: he "approves the publishing of this book, to preserve the strength and honour of marriage against those sad breaches and dangerous abuses of it." Belike then the wrongful suffering of all those sad breaches and abuses in marriage to a remediless thralldom, is the strength and honour of marriage; a boisterous and bestial strength, a dishonourable honour, an infatuated doctrine, worse than the Salvo jure of tyrannizing, which we all fight against. Next he saith, that "common discontents make these breaches in unstaidd minds, and men given to change." His words may be apprehended, as if they disallowed only to divorce for common discontents, in unstaidd minds, having no cause, but a desire of change, and then we agree. But if he take all discontents on this side adultery, to be common, that is to say, not difficult to endure, and to affect only unstaidd minds, it might administer just cause to think him the unfittest man that could be, to offer at a * comment upon Job; as seeming by this to have no more true sense of a good man in his afflictions, than those Edomitish friends had, of whom Job complains, and against whom God testifies his anger. Shall a man of your own coat, who hath espoused his flock; and represents Christ more, in being the true husband of his congregation, than an ordinary man doth in being the husband of his wife, (and yet this representment is thought a chief cause why marriage must be inseparable) shall this spiritual man ordinarily for the increase of his maintenance, or any slight cause, forsake that wedded cure of souls, that should be dearest to him, and marry another and another? And shall not a person wrongfully afflicted, and persecuted even to extremity, forsake an unfit, injurious, and pestilent mate, tied only by a civil and fleshly covenant? If you be a man so much hating change, hate that other change; if yourself be not guilty, counsel your brethren to hate it; and leave to be the supercilious judge of other

* Mr. Caryl.

men's miseries and changes, that your own be not judged. "The reasons of your licensed pamphlet," you say "are good;" they must be better than your own then; I shall wonder else how such a trivial fellow was accepted and commended, to be the confuter of so dangerous an opinion as ye give out mine.

Now therefore to your attorney, since no worthier an adversary makes his appearance, nor this neither his appearance, but lurking under the safety of his nameless obscurity; such as ye turn him forth at the postern, I must accept him; and in a better temper than Ajax, do mean to scourge this ram for ye, till I meet with his Ulysses.

He begins with law, and we have it of him as good cheap as any huckster at law, newly set up, can possibly afford, and as impertinent; but for that he hath received his hansel. He presumes also to cite the civil law, which I perceive, by his citing, never came within his dormitory; yet what he cites, makes but against himself.

His second thing therefore, is to refute the adverse position, and very methodically, three pages before he sets it down; and sets his own in the place, "that disagreement of mind or disposition, though shewing itself in much sharpness, is not by the law of God or man a just cause of divorce."

To this position I answer; That it lays no battery against mine, no nor so much as faces it, but tacks about, long ere it come near, like a harmless and respectful confutement. For I confess that disagreement of mind or disposition, though in much sharpness, is not always a just cause of divorce; for much may be endured. But what if the sharpness be much more than his much? To that point it is our mishap we have not here his grave decision. He that will contradict the position which I alledged, must hold that no disagreement of mind or disposition can divorce, though shewn in most sharpness; otherwise he leaves a place for equity to appoint limits, and so his following arguments will either not prove his own position, or not disprove mine.

His first argument, all but what hobbles to no purpose is this; "Where the Scripture commands a thing to be done, it appoints when, how, and for what, as in the case of death, or excommunication. But the Scripture directs not what measure of disagreement or contrariety may divorce; therefore the Scripture allows not any divorce for disagreement."

Ans. First, I deny your major; the Scripture appoints many things, and yet leaves the circumstance to man's discretion, particularly in your own examples; excommunication is not taught when, and for what to be, but left to the Church. How could the licenser let pass this childish ignorance, and call it "good?" Next, in matters of death, the laws of England, whereof you have intruded to be an opiniastrous sub-advocate, and are bound to defend them, conceive it not enjoined in Scripture, when or for what cause they shall put to death, as in adultery, theft, and the like. Your minor also is false, for the Scripture plainly sets down for what measure of disagreement a man may divorce, Deut. xxiv. 1. Learn better what that phrase means, "if she find no favour in his eyes"

Your second argument, without more tedious fumbling, is briefly thus: "If diversity in religion, which breeds a greater dislike than any natural disagreement, may not cause a divorce, then may not the lesser disagreement: But diversity of religion may not; Ergo."

Ans. First, I deny in the major, that diversity of religion breeds a greater dislike to marriage-duties, than natural disagreement. For between Israelite, or christian and infidel, more often hath been seen too much love: but between them who perpetually clash in natural contrarieties, it is repugnant that there should be ever any married love or concord. Next, I deny your minor, that it is commanded not to divorce in diversity of religion, if the infidel will stay: for that place in St. Paul commands nothing, as that book at large affirmed, though you over-skip it.

Secondly,

Secondly, If it do command, it is but with condition that the infidel be content, and well-pleased to stay, which cuts off the supposal of any great hatred or disquiet between them, seeing the infidel had liberty to depart at pleasure; and so this comparison avails nothing.

Your third argument is from Deut. xxii. "If a man hate his wife, and raise an ill report, that he found her no virgin;" if this were false, "he might not put her away," though hated never so much.

Answer. This was a malicious hatred, bent against her life, or to send her out of doors without her portion. Such a hater loses by due punishment that privilege, Deut. xxiv. 1. to divorce for a natural dislike; which though it could not love conjugally, yet sent away civilly, and with just conditions. But doubtless the wife in that former case had liberty to depart from her false accuser, lest his hatred should prove mortal; else that law peculiarly made to right the woman, had turned to her greatest mischief.

Your fourth argument is; "One christian ought to bear the infirmities of another, but chiefly of his wife."

Answer. I grant infirmities, but not outrages, not perpetual defraudments of truest conjugal society, not injuries and vexations as importunate as fire. Yet to endure very much, might do well an exhortation, but not a compulsive law. For the spirit of God himself, by Solomon, declares that such a consort "the earth cannot bear, and better dwell in a corner of the house-top, or in the wilderness." Burthens may be borne, but still with consideration to the strength of an honest man complaining. Charity indeed bids us forgive our enemies, yet doth not force us to continue friendship and familiarity with those friends who have been false or unworthy towards us; but is contented in our peace with them, at a fair distance. Charity commands not the husband to receive again into his bosom the adulterous wife, but thinks it enough, if he dismiss her with a beneficent and peaceful dismissal. No more doth charity command; nor can her rule compel, to retain in nearest union of wedlock, one whose other grossest faults, or disabilities to perform what was covenanted, are the just causes of as much grievance and dissension in a family, as the private act of adultery. Let not therefore, under the name of fulfilling charity, such an unmerciful and more than legal yoke, be padlocked upon the neck of any christian.

Your fifth argument: "If the husband ought to love his wife, as Christ his Church, then ought she not to be put away for contrariety of mind."

Answer. This similitude turns against him: For if the husband must be as Christ to the wife, then must the wife be as the Church to her husband. If there be a perpetual contrariety of mind in the Church toward Christ, Christ himself threatens to divorce such a spouse, and hath often done it. If they urge, this was no true Church, I urge again that was no true wife.

His sixth argument is from Matth. v. 32. which he expounds after the old fashion, and never takes notice of what I brought against that exposition; let him therefore seek his answer there. Yet can he not leave this argument, but he must needs first shew us a curvet of his madness, holding out an objection, and running himself upon the point. "For," saith he, "if Christ except no cause but adultery, then all other causes, as frigidity, incestuous marriage, &c. are no causes of divorce;" and answers, "that the speech of Christ holds universally, as he intended it; namely, to condemn such divorce as was groundlessly practised among the Jews, for every cause which they thought sufficient; not checking the law of consanguinities or affinities, or forbidding other cause which makes marriage void, ipso facto."

Ans. Look to it now, you be not found taking fees on both sides; for if you once bring limitations to the universal words of Christ, another will do as much with as good authority; and affirm, that neither did he check the law, Deut. xxiv. 1. nor forbid the causes that make marriage void actually; which if any thing in the world doth, unfitness

doth, and contrariety of mind; yea, more than adultery, for that makes not the marriage void, nor much more unfit, but for the time, if the offended party forgive: But unfitness and contrariety frustrates and nullifies for ever, unless it be a rare chance, all the good and peace of wedded conversation; and leaves nothing between them enjoyable, but a prone and savage necessity, not worth the name of marriage, unaccompanied with love. Thus much his own objection hath done against himself.

Argument 7th. He insists, "that man and wife are one flesh, therefore must not separate." But must be sent to look again upon the * 35th page of that book, where he might read an answer, which he stirs not. Yet can he not abstain, but he must do us another pleasure ere he goes; although I call the common pleas to witness, I have not hired his tongue, whatever men may think by his arguing. For besides adultery, he excepts other causes which dissolve the union of being one flesh, either directly, or by consequence. If only adultery be excepted by our Saviour, and he voluntarily can add other exceptions that dissolve that union, both directly and by consequence; these words of Christ, the main obstacle of divorce, are open to us by his own invitation, to include whatever causes dissolve that union of flesh, either directly or by consequence. Which, till he name other causes more likely, I affirm to be done soonest by unfitness and contrariety of mind; for that induces hatred, which is the greatest dissolver both of spiritual and corporal union, turning the mind, and consequently the body, to other objects. Thus our doughty adversary, either directly or by consequence, yields us the question with his own mouth; and the next thing he does, recants it again.

His 8th argument shivers in the uttering, and he confesseth to be "not over confident of it;" but of the rest it may be sworn he is. St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. saith, that the "married have trouble in the flesh," therefore we must bear it, though never so intolerable.

I answer, if this be a true consequence, why are not all troubles to be borne alike? Why are we suffered to divorce adulteries, desertions, or frigidities? Who knows not that trouble and affliction is the decree of God upon every state of life? Follows it therefore, that though they grow excessive and insupportable, we must not avoid them? If we may in all other conditions, and not in marriage, the doom of our suffering ties us not by the trouble, but by the bond of marriage; and that must be proved inseparable from other reasons, not from this place. And his own confession declares the weakness of this argument, yet his ungoverned arrogance could not be dissuaded from venting it.

His 9th argument is, "that a husband must love his wife as himself; therefore he may not divorce for any disagreement, no more than he may separate his soul from his body."

I answer: if he love his wife as himself, he must love her so far as he may preserve him to her in a chearful and comfortable manner, and not so as to ruin himself by anguish and sorrow, without any benefit to her. Next, if the husband must love his wife as himself, she must be understood a wife in some reasonable measure, willing and sufficient to perform the chief duties of her covenant, else by the hold of this argument, it would be his great sin to divorce either for adultery or desertion. The rest of this will run circuit with the union of one flesh, which was answered before. And that to divorce a relative and metaphorical union of two bodies into one flesh, cannot be likened in all things to the dividing of that natural union of soul and body into one person, is apparent of itself.

His last argument he fetches "from the inconvenience that would follow upon this freedom of divorce, to the corrupting of men's minds, and the overturning of all human society."

But for me, let God and Moses answer this blasphemer, who dares bring in such a foul indictment against the divine law. Why did God permit this to his people the Jews, but that the right and good which came directly thereby, was more in his esteem, than the wrong and evil which came by accident? And for those weak supposes of infants that would be left in their mothers belly (which must needs be good news for chamber-maids, to hear a

* First Edition.

servant-man grown so provident for great bellies) and portions and jointures likely to incur imbezlement hereby, the ancient civil law instructs us plentifully how to award, which our profound opposite knew not, for it was not in his tenures.

His arguments are spun; now follows the chaplain with his antiquities, wiser if he had refrained, for his very touching ought that is learned, soils it, and lays him still more and more open, a conspicuous gull. There being both fathers and councils more ancient, wherewith to have served his purpose better than with what he cites, how may we do to know the subtle drift that moved him to begin first with the "twelfth council of Toledo?" I would not undervalue the depth of his notion; but perhaps he had heard that the men of Toledo had store of good blade-mettle, and were excellent at cuttling: Who can tell but it might be the reach of his policy, that these able men of decision would do best to have the prime stroke among his testimonies in deciding this cause? But all this craft avails him not; for seeing they allow no cause of divorce but fornication, what do these keen doctors here, but cut him over the sinews with their Toledo's, for holding in the precedent page other causes of divorce besides, both directly and by consequence? As evil doth that Saxon council, next quoted, bestead him. For if it allow divorce precisely for no cause but fornication, it thwarts his own exposition: and if it understand fornication largely, it sides with whom he would confute. However, the authority of that synod can be but small, being under Theodorus, the Canterbury bishop, a Grecian monk of Tarsus, revolted from his own Church to the Pope. What have we next? The civil law stuffed in between two councils, as if the Code had been some synod; for that he understood himself in this quotation, is incredible; where the law, Cod. l. 3. tit. 38. leg. 11. speaks not of divorce, but against the dividing of possessions to divers heirs, whereby the married servants of a great family were divided, perhaps into distant countries and colonies; father from son, wife from husband, fore against their will. Somewhat lower he confesseth, that the civil law allows many reasons of divorce, but the canon law decrees otherwise; a fair credit to his cause! And I amaze me, though the fancy of this doubt be as obtuse and sad as any mallet, how the licenser could sleep out all this, and suffer him to uphold his opinion by canons and Gregorial decretals; a law which not only his adversary, but the whole reformation of this Church and state hath branded and rejected. As ignorantly, and too ignorantly to deceive any reader but an unlearned, he talks of Justin Martyr's apology, not telling us which of the twain; for that passage in the beginning of his first, which I have cited elsewhere, plainly makes against him: So doth Tertullian, cited next, and next Erasmus, the one against Marcion, the other in his annotations on Matthew, and to the Corinthians. And thus ye have the list of his choice antiquities, as pleasantly chosen as ye would wish from a man of his handy vocation, puffed up with no luck at all; above the stint of his capacity.

Now he comes to the position, which I set down whole; and like an able textman, flits it into four, that he may the better come at it with his barber-surgery, and his sleeves turned up. Wherein first, he denies "that any disposition, unfitness, or contrariety of mind, is unchangeable in nature, but that by the help of diet and physick it may be altered."

I mean not to dispute philosophy with this pork, who never read any. But I appeal to all experience, though there be many drugs to purge these redundant humours and circulations, that commonly impair health, and are not natural, whether any man can with the safety of his life bring a healthy constitution into physick with this design, to alter his natural temperament and disposition of mind. How much more vain and ridiculous would it be, by altering and rooting up the grounds of nature, which is most likely to produce death or madness, to hope the reducing of a mind to this or that fitness, or two disagreeing minds to a mutual sympathy? Suppose they might, and that with great danger of their lives and right senses, alter one temperature, how can they know that the succeeding disposition will not be as far from fitness and agreement? They would perhaps change melancholy into sanguine; but what if phlegm and choler in as great a measure

come instead, the unfitness will be still as difficult and troublesome? But lastly, whether these things be changeable or not, experience teaches us, and our position supposes that they seldom do change in any time commensurable to the necessities of man, or convenient to the ends of marriage: and if the fault be in the one, shall the other live all his days in bondage and misery for another's perverseness, or immedicable disaffection? To my friends, of which may fewest be so unhappy, I have a remedy, as they know, more wise and manly to prescribe: but for his friends and followers (of which many may deserve justly to feel themselves the unhappiness which they consider not in others) I send them by his advice to sit upon the stool and strain, till their cross dispositions and contrarities of mind shall change to a better correspondence, and to a quicker apprehension of common sense, and their own good.

His second reason is as heedless; "because that grace may change the disposition, therefore no indisposition may cause divorce."

Ans. First, it will not be deniable that many persons, gracious both, may yet happen to be very unfitly married, to the great disturbance of either. Secondly, What if one have grace, the other not, and will not alter, as the Scriptures testify there be of those, in whom we may expect a change, when "the black-a-moor changes his colour, or the leopard his spots," Jer. xiii. 23. Shall the gracious therefore dwell in torment all his life, for the ungracious? We see that holiest precepts, than which there can no better physic be administered to the mind of man, and set on with powerful preaching, cannot work this cure, no not in the family, not in the wife of him that preaches day and night to her. What an unreasonable thing is it, that men, and clergymen especially, should exact such wondrous changes in another man's house, and are seen to work so little in their own?

To the second point of the position, that this unfitness hinders the main ends and benefits of marriage; he answers, "if I mean the unfitness of choler, or sullen disposition, that soft words, according to Solomon, pacify wrath."

But I reply, that the saying of Solomon is a proverb, frequently true, not universally, as both the event shews, and many other sentences written by the same author, particularly of an evil woman, Prov. xxi. 9, 19. and in other chapters, that she is better shunned than dwelt with, and a desert is preferred before her society. What need the spirit of God put this choice into our heads, if soft words could always take effect with her? How frivolous is not only this disputer, but he that taught him thus, and let him come abroad?

To his second answer I return this, that although there be not easily found such an antipathy, as to hate one another like a toad or poison; yet that there is oft such a dislike in both, or either, to conjugal love, as hinders all the comfort of matrimony, scarce any can be so simple as not to apprehend. And what can be that favour, found or not found, in the eyes of the husband, but a natural liking or disliking; whereof the law of God, Deut. xxiv. bears witness, as of an ordinary accident, and determines wisely and divinely thereafter. And this disaffection happening to be in the one, not without the unspeakable discomfort of the other, must he be left like a thing consecrated to calamity and despair, without redemption?

Against the third branch of the position, he denies that "solace and peace, which is contrary to discord and variance, is the main end of marriage." What then? He will have it "the solace of male and female." Came this doctrine out of some school, or some sty? Who but one forsaken of all sense and civil nature, and chiefly of christianity, will deny that peace, contrary to discord, is the calling and the general end of every christian, and of all his actions, and more especially of marriage, which is the dearest league of love, and the dearest resemblance of that love which in Christ is dearest to his Church? How then can peace and comfort, as it is contrary to discord, which God hates to dwell with, not be the main end of marriage? Discord then we ought to fly, and to pursue peace, far above the observance of a civil covenant already broken, and the breaking daily iterated on the other side. And what better testimony than the words of
the

the institution itself, to prove that a conversing solace and peaceful society, is the prime end of marriage, without which no other help or office can be mutual, befitting the dignity of reasonable creatures, that such as they should be coupled in the rites of nature by the mere compulsion of lust, without love or peace, worse than wild beasts? Nor was it half so wisely spoken as some deem, though Austin spake it, that if God had intended other than copulation in marriage, he would for Adam have created a friend, rather than a wife, to converse with; and our own writers blame him for this opinion: for which and the like passages, concerning marriage, he might be justly taxed of rusticity in these affairs. For this cannot but be with ease conceived, that there is one society of grave friendship, and another amiable and attractive society of conjugal love, besides the deed of procreation, which of itself soon cloyes, and is despised, unless it be cherished and re-incited with a pleasing conversation. Which if ignoble and swinish minds cannot apprehend, shall such merit therefore to be the censures of more generous and vertuous spirits?

Against the last point of the position, to prove that contrariety of mind is not a greater cause of divorce than corporal frigidity, he enters into such a tedious and drawling tale of burning, and burning, and lust and burning," that the dull argument itself burns too for want of stirring; and yet all this burning is not able to expel the frigidity of his brain. So long therefore as that cause in the position shall be proved a sufficient cause of divorce, rather than spend words with this fleamy clod of an antagonist, more than of necessity and a little merriment, I will not now contend whether it be a greater cause than frigidity or no.

His next attempt is upon the arguments which I brought to prove the position. And for the first, not finding it of that structure as to be scaled with his short ladder, he retreats with a bravado, that it deserves no answer. And I as much wonder what the whole book deserved, to be thus troubled and solicited by such a paltry solicitor. I would he had not cast the gracious eye of his duncery upon the small deserts of a pamphlet, whose every line meddled with, uncases him to scorn and laughter.

That which he takes for the second argument, if he look better, is no argument, but an induction to those that follow. Then he stumbles that I should say, "the gentlest ends of marriage," confessing that he understands it not. And I believe him heartily: For how should he, a serving-man both by nature and by function, an Idiot by breeding, and a solicitor by presumption, ever come to know or feel within himself what the meaning is of "gentle?" He blames it for "a neat phrase," for nothing angers him more than his own proper contrary. Yet altogether without art sure he is not; for who could have devised to give us more briefly a better description of his own servility?

But what will become now of the business I know not; for the man is suddenly taken with a lunacy of law, and speaks revelations out of the attorney's academy only from a lying spirit: For he says, "that where a thing is void ipso facto, there needs no legal proceeding to make it void:" which is false, for marriage is void by adultery or frigidity, yet not made void without legal proceeding. Then asks my opinion of John-a-Noaks and John a-Stiles: And I answer him, that I, for my part, think John Dory was a better man than both of them; for certainly they were the greatest wranglers that ever lived, and have filled all our law-books with the obtunding story of their suits and trials.

After this he tells a miraculous piece of antiquity, how "two Romans, Titus and Sempronius, made Feoffments," at Rome sure, and levied fines by the common law. But now his fit of law past, yet hardly come to himself, he maintains, that if marriage be void, as being neither of God nor nature, "there needs no legal proceeding to part it," and I tell him that offends not me: Then, quoth he, "this is nothing to your book, being the Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce." But that I deny him; for all discipline is not legal, that is to say, juridical, but some is personal, some oeconomic, and some ecclesiastical.

Lastly, If I prove that contrary dispositions are joined neither of God nor nature, and so the marriage void, "he will give me the controversy." I have proved it in that book to any wise man, and without more ado the institution proves it.

Where I answer an objection usually made, that "the disposition ought to be known before marriage," and shew how difficult it is to chuse a fit consort, and how easy to mistake; the servitor would know "what I mean by conversation," declaring his capacity nothing refined since his law-puddering, but still the same it was in the pantry, and at the dresser. Shall I argue of conversation with this hoyden, to go and practise at his opportunities in the larder? To men of quality I have said enough; and experience confirms by daily example that wisest, soberest, justest men are sometimes miserably mistaken in their choice. Whom to leave thus without remedy, tost and tempested in a most unquiet sea of afflictions and temptations, I say is most unchristianly.

But he goes on to untruss my arguments, imagining them his master's points. Only in the passage following, I cannot but admire the ripeness, and the pregnancy of his native treachery, endeavouring to be more a fox than his wit will suffer him. Whereas I briefly mentioned certain heads of discourse, which I referred to a place more proper according to my method, to be treated there at full with all their reasons about them, this brain-worm against all the laws of dispute, will needs deal with them here. And as a country hind, sometimes ambitious to shew his betters that he is not so simple as you take him, and that he knows his advantages, will teach us a new trick to confute by. And would you think to what a pride he swells in the contemplation of his rare stratagem, offering to carp at the language of a book, which yet he confesses to be generally commended; while himself will be acknowledged by all that read him, the basest and the hungriest inditer, that could take the boldness to look abroad. Observe now the arrogance of a groom, how it will mount. I had written that common adultery is a thing which the rankest politician would think it shame and disworship, that his law should countenance. First, it offends him, that "rankest" should signify ought but his own smell: who that knows English would not understand me, when I say a rank serving-man, a rank pettifogger, to mean a mere serving-man, a mere and arrant pettifogger, who lately was so hardy, as to lay aside his buckram-wallet, and make himself a fool in print, with confuting books which are above him? Next, the word "Politician" is not used to his maw, and thereupon he plays the most notorious hobby horse, jesting and frisking in the luxury of his nonsense with such poor fetches to cog a laughter from us, that no antic hob-nail at a morris, but is more handsomely facetious.

Concerning that place Deut. xxiv. 1. which he saith to be "the main pillar of my opinion," though I rely more on the institution than on that: These two pillars I do indeed confess are to me as those two in the porch of the temple, Jachin and Boaz, which names import establishment and strength; nor do I fear who can shake them. The exposition of Deut. which I brought, is the received exposition, both ancient and modern, by all learned men, unless it be a monkish papist here and there: and the gloss which he and his obscure assistant would persuade us to, is merely new and absurd, presuming out of his utter ignorance in the Hebrew, to interpret those words of the text; first, in a mistaken sense of uncleanness, against all approved writers. Secondly, in a limited sense, whenas the original speaks without limitation, "some uncleanness, or any:" and it had been a wise law indeed to mean itself particular, and not to express the case which this acute Rabbi hath all this while been hooking for; whereby they who are most partial to him may guess that something is in this doctrine which I alledge, that forces the adversary to such a new and strained exposition: Wherein he does nothing for above four pages, but founders himself to and fro in his own objections; one while denying that divorce was permitted, another while affirming that it was permitted for the wife's sake, and after all, distrusts himself. And for his surest retirement, betakes him to those old suppositions, "that Christ abolished the mosaic law of divorce; that the
Jews

Jews had not sufficient knowledge in this point, through the darkness of the dispensation of heavenly things; that under the plenteous grace of the gospel, we are tied by cruellest compulsion to live in marriage till death with the wickedest, the worst, the most persecuting mate. These ignorant and doting surmises he might have read confuted at large, even in the first edition; but found it safer to pass that part over in silence. So that they who see not the sottishness of this his new and tedious exposition, are worthy to love it dearly.

His explanation done, he charges me with a wicked gloss, and almost blasphemy, for saying that Christ in teaching, meant not always to be taken word for word; but like a wise physician, administering one excess against another, to reduce us to a perfect mean. Certainly to teach us, were no dishonest method: Christ himself hath often used hyperboles in his teaching; and gravest authors, both Aristotle in the second of his "Ethics to Nichomachus," and Seneca in his seventh "de Beneficiis," advise us to stretch out the line of precept oft-times beyond measure, that while we tend further, the mean might be the easier attained. And whoever comments that vth of Matthew, when he comes to the turning of cheek after cheek to blows, and the parting both with cloak and coat, if any please to be the riser, will be forced to recommend himself to the same exposition, though this chattering law-monger be bold to call it wicked. Now note another precious piece of him; Christ, saith he, "doth not say that an unchaste look is adultery, but the lusting after her; as if the looking unchastely could be without lusting. This gear is licensed for good reason; "Imprimatur."

Next he would prove that the speech of Christ is not uttered in excess against the Pharisees, first, "because he speaks it to his disciples," Matth. v. which is false, for he spake it to the multitude, as by the first verse is evident, among which in all likelihood were many Pharisees, but out of doubt, all of them Pharisean disciples, and bred up in their doctrine; from which extremes of error and falsity, Christ throughout his whole sermon labours to reclaim the people. Secondly, saith he, "because Christ forbids not only putting away, but marrying her who is put away." Acutely, as if the Pharisees might not have offended as much in marrying the divorced, as in divorcing the married. The precept may bind all, rightly understood; and yet the vehement manner of giving it, may be occasioned only by the Pharisees.

Finally, he winds up his text with much doubt and trepidation; for it may be his trenchers were not scraped, and that which never yet afforded corn of savour to his noddle, the salt-feller was not rubbed: and therefore in this haste easily granting, that his answers fall foul upon each other, and praying, you would not think he writes as a prophet, but as a man, he runs to the black jack, fills his flaggon, spreads the table, and serves up dinner.

After waiting and voiding, he thinks to void my second argument, and the contradictions that will follow both in the law and gospel, if the Mosaic law were abrogated by our Saviour, and a compulsive prohibition fixed instead: and sings his old song, "that the gospel counts unlawful that which the law allowed," instancing in circumcision, sacrifices, washings. But what are these ceremonial things to the changing of a moral point in household duty, equally belonging to Jew and Gentile? Divorce was then right, now wrong; then permitted in the rigorous time of law, now forbidden by law, even to the most extremely afflicted, in the favourable time of grace and freedom. But this is not for an unbuttoned fellow to discuss in the garret at his tressle, and dimension of candle by the snuff; which brought forth his scullionly paraphrase on St. Paul, whom he brings in, discoursing such idle stuff to the maids and widows, as his own servile inurbanity forbears not to put into the apostle's mouth, "of the soul's conversing:" and this he presumes to do, being a bayard, who never had the soul to know what conversing means, but as his provender, and the familiarity of the kitchen schooled his conceptions.

He passes to the third argument, like a boar in a vineyard, doing naught else, but still as he goes champing and chewing over, what I could mean by this chimæra of a "fit conversing soul," notions and words never made for those chops; but like a generous wine, only by over-working the settled mud of his fancy, to make him drunk, and disgorge his vileness the more openly. All persons of gentle breeding (I say "gentle," though this barrow grunt at the word) I know will apprehend, and be satisfied in what I spake, how unpleasing and discontenting the society of body must needs be between those whose minds cannot be sociable. But what should a man say more to a snout in this pickle? What language can be low and degenerate enough?

The fourth argument which I had, was, that marriage being a covenant, the very being whereof consists in the performance of unfeigned love and peace: if that were not tolerably performed, the covenant became broke and revocable. Which how can any, in whose mind the principles of right reason and justice are not cancelled, deny? For how can a thing subsist, when the true essence thereof is dissolved? Yet this he denies, and yet in such a manner as alters my assertion; for he puts in, "though the main end be not attained in full measure:" but my position is, if it be not tolerably attained, as throughout the whole discourse is apparent.

Now for his reasons; "Heman found not that peace and solace which is the main end of communion with God, should he therefore break off that communion?"

I answer, that if Heman found it not, the fault was certainly his own: but in marriage it happens far otherwise: sometimes the fault is plainly not his who seeks divorce: sometimes it cannot be discerned whose fault it is; and therefore cannot in reason or equity be the matter of an absolute prohibition.

His other instance declares, what a right handy-crafts man he is of petty cases, and how unfit to be aught else at highest, but a hackney of the law. "I change houses with a man; it is supposed I do it for my own ends; I attain them not in this house; I shall not therefore go from my bargain." How without fear might the young Charinus in Andria now cry out, "What likenesses can be here to a marriage?" In this bargain was no capitulation, but the yielding of possession to one another, wherein each of them had his several end apart. In marriage there is a solemn vow of love and fidelity each to other: this bargain is fully accomplished in the change; in marriage the covenant still is in performing. If one of them perform nothing tolerably, but instead of love, abound in disaffection, disobedience, fraud, and hatred; what thing in the nature of a covenant shall bind the other to such a perdurable mischief? Keep to your problems of ten groats, these matters are not for pragmatics, and folk-mooters to babble in.

Concerning the place of Paul, that "God hath called us to peace," 1 Cor. vii. and therefore, certainly, if any where in this world, we have a right to claim it reasonably in marriage; it is plain enough in the sense which I gave, and confessed by Paræus, and other orthodox divines, to be a good sense, and this answerer doth not weaken it. The other place, that "he who hateth, may put away," which, if I shew him, he promises to yield the whole controversy, is, besides Deut. xxiv. 1. Deut. xxi. 14. and before this, Exod. xxi. 8. Of Malachi I have spoken more in another place; and say again, that the best interpreters, all the ancient, and most of the modern translate it, as I cite it, and very few otherwise, whereof perhaps Junius is the chief.

Another thing troubles him, that marriage is called "the mystery of joy." Let it still trouble him; for what hath he to do either with joy or with mystery? He thinks it frantic divinity to say, it is not the outward continuance of marriage that keeps the covenant of marriage whole; but whosoever doth most according to peace and love, whether in marriage or divorce, he breaks marriage least. If I shall spell it to him, he breaks marriage least, is to say, he dishonours not marriage; for least is taken in the bible, and other good authors, for, not at all. And a particular marriage a man may break, if for a lawful cause, and yet not break, that is, not violate, or dishonour the ordinance

ordinance of marriage. Hence those two questions that follow, are left ridiculous ; and the maids at Aldgate, whom he flouts, are likely to have more wit than the serving-man at Addle-gate.

Whereas he taxes me of adding to the scripture, in that I said love only is the fulfilling of every commandment, I cited no particular scripture, but spake a general sense, which might be collected from many places. For seeing love includes faith, what is there that can fulfil every commandment but only love? and I meant, as any intelligent reader might apprehend, every positive and civil commandment, whereof Christ hath taught us that man is the lord. It is not the formal duty of worship, or the sitting still, that keeps the holy rest of Sabbath ; but whosoever doth most according to charity, whether he works or works not, he breaks the holy rest of sabbath least. So marriage being a civil ordinance, made for man, not man for it : he who doth that which most accords with charity, first to himself, next to whom he next owes it, whether in marriage or divorce, he breaks the ordinance of marriage least. And what in religious prudence can be charity to himself, and what to his wife, either in continuing, or in dissolving the marriage-knot, hath been already oft enough discoursed. So that what St. Paul saith of circumcision, the same I stick not to say of a civil ordinance, made to the good and comfort of man, not to his ruin ; marriage is nothing, and divorce is nothing, “ but faith which worketh by love.” And this I trust none can mistake.

Against the fifth argument, that a christian in a higher order of priesthood than that levitical, is a person dedicate to joy and peace ; and therefore needs not in subjection to a civil ordinance, made to no other end but for his good, (when without his fault he finds it impossible to be decently or tolerably observed) to plunge himself into immeasurable distractions and temptations, above his strength ; against this he proves nothing, but gads into silly conjectures of what abuses would follow, and with as good reason might declaim against the best things that are.

Against the sixth argument, that to force the continuance of marriage between minds found utterly unfit and disproportional, is against nature, and seems forbid under that allegorical precept of Moses, “ not to sow a field with divers seeds, lest both be defiled ; not to plough with an ox and an ass together, which I deduced by the pattern of St. Paul’s reasoning what was meant by not muzzling the ox ; he rambles over a long narration, to tell us that “ by the oxen are meant the preachers :” which is not doubted. Then he demands, “ if this my reasoning be like St. Paul’s.” And I answer him, yes. He replies, that sure St. Paul would be ashamed to reason thus. And I tell him, No. He grants that place which I alledged, 2 Cor. vi. of unequal yoking, may allude to that of Moses, but says, “ I cannot prove it makes to my purpose,” and shews not first how he can disprove it. Weigh gentlemen, and consider, whether my affirmations, backed with reason, may hold balance against the bare denials of this ponderous confuter, elected by his ghostly patrons to be my copes-mate.

Proceeding on to speak of mysterious things in nature, I had occasion to fit the language thereafter ; matters not, for the reading of this odious fool, who thus ever when he meets with aught above the cogitation of his breeding, leaves the noisome stench of his rude slot behind him, maligning that any thing should be spoke or understood above his own genuine baseness ; and gives sentence that his confuting hath been employed about a frothy, immeritous, and undeserving discourse. Who could have believed so much insolence durst vent itself from out the hide of a varlet, as thus to censure that which men of mature judgment have applauded to be writ with good reason ? But this contents him not, he falls now to rave in his barbarous abusiveness ; and why ? a reason befitting such an artificer, because he saith the book is contrary to all human learning ; whenas the world knows, that all both human and divine learning, till the canon-law, allowed divorce by consent, and for many causes without consent. Next, he dooms it as contrary to truth ; whenas it hath been disputable among learned men, ever since it

was prohibited : and is by Peter Martyr thought an opinion not impious, but hard to be refuted ; and by Erasmus deemed a doctrine so charitable and pious, as, if it cannot be used, were to be wished it could ; but is by Martin Bucer, a man of dearest and most religious memory in the church, taught and maintained to be either most lawfully used, or most lawfully permitted. And for this, for I affirm no more than Bucer, what censure do you think, readers, he hath condemned the book to ? To a death no less impious than to be burnt by the hangman. Mr. Licenser, (for I deal not now with this caitiff, never worth my earnest, and now not seasonable for my jest,) you are reputed a man discreet enough, religious enough, honest enough, that is, to an ordinary competence in all these. But now your turn is, to hear what your own hand hath earned ye ; that when you suffered this nameless hangman to cast into public such a despiteful contumely upon a name and person deserving of the church and state equally to yourself ; and one who hath done more to the present advancement of your own tribe, than you or many of them have done for themselves ; you forgot to be either honest, religious, or discreet. Whatever the state might do concerning it, supposed a matter to expect evil from, I should not doubt to meet among them with wise, and honourable, and knowing men : But as to this brute libel, so much the more impudent and lawless for the abused authority which it bears ; I say again, that I abominate the censure of rascals and their licensers.

With difficulty I return to what remains of this ignoble task, for the disdain I have to change a period more with the filth and venom of this gourmand, swelled into a confuter ; yet, for the satisfaction of others, I endure all this.

Against the seventh argument, that if the canon law and divines allow divorce for conspiracy of death, they may as well allow it to avoid the same consequence from the likelihood of natural causes.

First, he denies that the canon so decrees.

I answer, that it decrees for danger of life, as much as for adultery, Decret. Gregor. l. 4. tit. 19. and in other places : And the best Civilians who cite the canon-law, so collect, as Schneidewin in Instit. tit. 10. p. 4. de Divort. And indeed, who would have denied it, but one of a reprobate ignorance in all he meddles with ?

Secondly, he saith, the case alters ; for there the offender, " who seeks the life, doth implicitly at least act a divorce."

And I answer, that here nature, though no offender, doth the same. But if an offender by acting a divorce, shall release the offended, this is an ample grant against himself. He saith, nature teaches to save life from one who seeks it. And I say, she teaches no less to save it from any other cause that endangers it. He saith, that here they are both actors. Admit they were, it would not be uncharitable to part them ; yet sometimes they are not both actors, but the one of them most lamentedly passive. So he concludes, we must not take advantage of our own faults and corruptions to release us from our duties. But shall we take no advantage to save ourselves from the faults of another, who hath annulled his right to our duty ? No, says he, " let them die of the fullens, and try who will pity them." Barbarian, the shame of all honest Attorneys ! why do they not hoise him over the bar and blanket him ?

Against the eighth argument, that they who are destitute of all marriageable gifts, except a body not plainly unfit, have not the calling to marry, and consequently married and so found, may be divorced : this, he saith, is nothing to the purpose, and not fit to be answered. I leave it therefore to the judgment of his masters.

Against the ninth argument, that marriage is a human society, and so chiefly seated in agreement and unity of mind : If therefore the mind cannot have that due society by marriage, that it may reasonably and humanly desire, it can be no human society, and so not without reason divorcible : here he falsifies, and turns what the position required of a reasonable agreement in the main matters of society into an agreement in all things, which makes the opinion not mine, and so he leaves it.

At

At last, and in good hour, we are come to his farewell, which is to be a concluding taste of his jabberment in law, the flashiest and the fustiest that ever corrupted in such an unswilled hog's head.

Against my tenth argument, as he calls it, but as I intended it, my other position, "That divorce is not a thing determinable by a compulsive law, for that all law is for some good that may be frequently attained without the admixture of a worse inconvenience: But the law forbidding divorce, never attains to any good end of such prohibition, but rather multiplies evil; therefore the prohibition of divorce is no good law." Now for his attorney's prize: but first, like a right cunning and sturdy logician, he denies my argument, not mattering whether in the major or minor; and saith, "there are many laws made for good, and yet that good is not attained, through the defaults of the party, but a greater inconvenience follows."

But I reply, that this answer builds upon a shallow foundation, and most unjustly supposes every one in default, who seeks divorce from the most injurious wedlock. The default therefore will be found in the law itself; which is neither able to punish the offender, but the innocent must withal suffer; nor can right the innocent in what is chiefly sought, the obtainment of love or quietness. His instances out of the common law, are all so quite beside the matter which he would prove, as may be a warning to all clients how they venture their business with such a cock-brained solicitor. For being to shew some law of England, attaining to no good end, and yet through no default of the party, who is thereby debarred all remedy, he shews us only how some do lose the benefit of good laws through their own default. His first example saith, "it is a just law that every one shall peaceably enjoy his estate in lands or otherwise." Does this law attain to no good end? The bar will blush at this most incogitant woodcock. But see if a draft of Littleton will recover him to his senses. "If this man having fee simple in his lands, yet will take a lease of his own lands from another, this shall be an estoppel to him in an assize from the recovering of his own land."

Mark now and register him! How many are there of ten thousand who have such a fee-simple in their scone, as to take a lease of their own lands from another? So that this inconvenience lights upon scarce one in an age, and by his own default; and the law of enjoying each man his own, is good to all others. But on the contrary, this prohibition of divorce is good to none, and brings inconvenience to numbers, who lie under intolerable grievances without their own default, through the wickedness or folly of another; and all this iniquity the law remedies not, but in a manner maintains. His other cases are directly to the same purpose, and might have been spared, but that he is a tradesman of the law, and must be borne with at his first setting up, to lay forth his best ware, which is only gibberish.

I have now done that, which for many causes I might have thought, could not likely have been my fortune, to be put to this under-work of scouring and unrubbing the low and sordid ignorance of such a presumptuous lozel. Yet Hercules had the labour once imposed upon him to carry dung out of the Augean stable. At any hand I would be rid of him: for I had rather, since the life of man is likened to a scene, that all my entrances and exits might mix with such persons only, whose worth erects them and their actions to a grave and tragic deportment, and not to have to do with clowns and vices. But if a man cannot peaceably walk into the world, but must be infested; sometimes at his face with dorrs and horse-flies, sometimes beneath with bawling whippets and shin barkers, and these to be set on by plot and consultation with a junto of clergymen and licensers, commended also and rejoiced in by those whose partiality cannot yet forego old papistical principles; have I not cause to be in such a manner defensive, as may procure me freedom to pass more unmolested hereafter by those incumbrances, not so much regarded for themselves, as for those who incite them? And what defence can properly be used in such a despicable encounter as this, but either

the slap or the spurn? If they can afford me none but a ridiculous adversary, the blame belongs not to me, though the whole dispute be strewed and scattered with ridiculous. And if he have such an ambition to know no better who are his mates, but among those needy thoughts, which, though his two faculties of serving-man and solicitor should compound into one mongrel, would be but thin and meagre, if in this penury of soul he can be possible to have the lustiness to think of fame, let him but send me how he calls himself, and I may chance not fail to indorse him on the backside of posterity, not a golden, but a brazen ass. Since my fate extorts from me a talent of sport, which I had thought to hide in a napkin, he shall be my *Batrachomomachia*, my *Bavius*, my *Calandrino*, the common adagy of ignorance and over-weening: Nay, perhaps, as the provocation may be, I may be driven to curl up this gliding prose into a rough sotadic, that shall rhyme him into such a condition, as instead of judging good books to be burnt by the executioner, he shall be readier to be his own hangman. Thus much to this nuisance.

But as for the subject itself which I have writ and now defend, according as the opposition bears; if any man equal to the matter, shall think it appertains him to take in hand this controversy, either excepting against aught written, or persuaded he can shew better how this question, of such moment to be thoroughly known, may receive a true determination, not leaning on the old and rotten suggestions whereon it yet leans; if his intents be sincere to the public, and shall carry him on without bitterness to the opinion, or to the person dissenting; let him not, I entreat him, guess by the handling, which meritoriously hath been bestowed on this object of contempt and laughter, that I account it any displeasure done me to be contradicted in print: But as it leads to the attainment of any thing more true, shall esteem it a benefit; and shall know how to return his civility and fair argument in such a sort, as he shall confess that to do so is my choice, and to have done thus was my chance.

T H E
T E N U R E
O F
K I N G S and M A G I S T R A T E S :
P R O V I N G

That it is lawful, and hath been held so through all ages, for any, who have the power, to call to account a TYRANT, or wicked KING, and after due conviction, to depose, and put him to death ; if the ordinary MAGISTRATE have neglected, or denied to do it.

And that they, who of late so much blame Deposing, are the men that did it themselves.*

IF Men within themselves would be governed by reason, and not generally give up their understanding to a double tyranny, of custom from without, and blind affections within ; they would discern better what it is to favour and uphold the tyrant of a nation. But being slaves within doors, no wonder that they strive so much to have the public state conformably governed to the inward vitious rule, by which they govern themselves. For indeed none can love freedom heartily, but good men : the rest love not freedom, but licence ; which never hath more scope, or more indulgence than under tyrants. Hence is it that tyrants are not oft offended, nor stand much in doubt of bad men, as being all naturally servile ; but in whom virtue and true worth most is eminent, them they fear in earnest, as by right their masters ; against them lies all their hatred and suspicion. Consequently neither do bad men hate tyrants, but have been always readiest, with the falsified names of Loyalty and Obedience, to colour over their base compliances. And although sometimes for shame, and when it comes to their own grievances, of purse especially, they would seem good patriots, and side with the better cause, yet when others for the deliverance of their country, endued with fortitude and heroic virtue, to fear nothing but the curse written against those “ that do the work of the Lord negligently,” † would go on to remove, not only the calamities and

* This tract, which was first published in February 1648-9, after the execution of king Charles. and is a defence of that action against the objections of the Presbyterians ; was in the year 1650, republished by the author with considerable additions, all which, omitted in every former edition of the author's works, are here carefully inserted in their proper places. The copy which I use, after the above title, has the following sentence ; “ Published now the second time with some additions, and many testimonies also added out of the best and learnedest among protestant divines, asserting the position of this book.” The passages here restored, are marked with inverted commas.

† Jer. xlviii. 1.

thraldoms of a people, but the roots and causes whence they spring; strait these men, and sure helpers at need, as if they hated only the miseries, but not the mischiefs, after they have juggled and paltered with the world, bandied and born arms against their king, divested him, disanointed him, nay cursed him all over in their pulpits, and their pamphlets, to the ingaging of sincere and real men, beyond what is possible or honest to retreat from, not only turn revolvers from those principles, which only could at first move them, but lay the stain of disloyalty, and worse on those proceedings, which are the necessary consequences of their own former actions; nor disliked by themselves, were they managed to the entire advantages of their own faction; not considering the while that he toward whom they boasted their new fidelity, counted them accessory; and by those statutes and laws which they so impotently brandish against others, would have doomed them to a traitor's death for what they have done already. 'Tis true, that most men are apt enough to civil wars and commotions as a novelty, and for a flash hot and active; but through sloth or inconstancy, and weakness of spirit, either fainting ere their own pretences, though never so just, be half attained, or through an inbred falsehood and wickedness, betray oft-times to destruction with themselves, men of noblest temper joined with them for causes, whereof they in their rash undertakings, were not capable. If God and a good cause give them victory, the prosecution whereof for the most part, inevitably draws after it the alteration of laws, change of government, downfall of princes with their families; then comes the task to those worthies which are the soul of that enterprize, to be sweat and laboured out amidst the throng and noses of vulgar and irrational men. Some contesting for privileges, customs, forms, and that old entanglement of iniquity, their gibberish laws, though the badge of their ancient slavery. Others who have been fiercest against their prince, under the notion of a tyrant, and no mean incendiaries of the war against him, when God out of his providence and high disposal hath delivered him into the hand of their brethren, on a sudden and in a new garb of allegiance, which their doings have long since cancelled; they plead for him, pity him, extol him, protest against those that talk of bringing him to the trial of justice, which is the sword of God, superior to all mortal things, in whose hand soever by apparent signs his testified will is to put it. But certainly, if we consider who and what they are, on a sudden grown so pitiful, we may conclude their pity can be no true and christian commiseration, but either levity and shallowness of mind, or else a carnal admiring of that worldly pomp and greatness, from whence they see him fallen; or rather, lastly, a dissembled and seditious pity, feigned of industry to beget new discord. As for mercy, if it be to a tyrant, under which name they themselves have cited him so oft in the hearing of God, of Angels, and the holy church assembled, and there charged him with the spilling of more innocent blood by far, than ever Nero did, undoubtedly the mercy which they pretend, is the mercy of wicked men, and "their mercies *," we read, "are cruelties;" hazarding the welfare of a whole nation, to have saved one whom they so oft have termed Agag, and vilifying the blood of many Jonathans that have saved Israel; insisting with much niceness on the unnecessary clause of their covenant wrested, wherein the fear of change and the absurd contradiction of a flattering hostility had hampered them, but not scrupling to give away for compliments, to an implacable revenge, the heads of many thousand christians more.

Another sort there is, who coming in the course of these affairs, to have their share in great actions above the form of law or custom, at least to give their voice and approbation; begin to swerve and almost shiver at the majesty and grandeur of some noble deed, as if they were newly entered into a great sin; disputing precedents, forms, and circumstances, when the commonwealth nigh perishes for want of deeds in substance, done with just and faithful expedition. To these I wish better instruction, and virtue equal to their calling;

* Prov. xii. 10.

the former of which, that is to say instruction, I shall endeavour, as my duty is, to bestow on them; and exhort them not to startle from the just and pious resolution of adhering with all their strength and assistance to the present parliament and army, in the glorious way wherein justice and victory hath set them; the only warrants thro' all ages, next under immediate revelation, to exercise supreme power; in those proceedings which hitherto appear equal to what hath been done in any age or nation heretofore, justly or magnanimously. Nor let them be discouraged or deterred by any new apostate scare-crows, who under show of giving counsel, send out their barking monitories and memento's, empty of aught else but the spleen of a frustrated faction. For how can that pretended counsel, be either sound or faithful, when they that give it, see not for madness and vexation of their ends lost, that those statutes and scriptures which both falsely and scandalously they wrest against their friends and associates, would by sentence of the common adversary, fall first and heaviest upon their own heads? Neither let mild and tender dispositions be foolishly softened from their duty and perseverance with the unmasculine rhetoric of any puling priest or chaplain, sent as a friendly letter of advice, for fashion-sake in private, and forthwith published by the sender himself, that we may know how much of friend there was in it, to cast an odious envy upon them to whom it was pretended to be sent in charity. Nor let any man be deluded by either the ignorance, or the notorious hypocrisy and self repugnance of our dancing divines, who have the conscience and the boldness to come with scripture in their mouths, glossed and fitted for their turns with a double contradictory sense, transforming the sacred verity of God to an idol with two faces, looking at once two several ways; and with the same quotations to charge others, which in the same case they made serve to justify themselves. For while the hope to be made classic and provincial lords led them on, while pluralities greased them thick and deep, to the shame and scandal of religion, more than all the sects and heresies they exclaim against; then to fight against the king's person, and no less a party of his lords and commons, or to put force upon both the houses, was good, was lawful, was no resisting of superior powers; they only were powers not to be resisted, who countenanced the good, and punished the evil. But now that their censorious domineering is not suffered to be universal, truth and conscience to be freed, tithes and pluralities to be no more, though competent allowance provided, and the warm experience of large gifts, and they so good at taking them; yet now to exclude and seize upon impeached members, to bring delinquents without exemption to a fair tribunal by the common national law against murder, is now to be no less than Corah, Dathan, and Abiram. He who but ere-while in the pulpits was a cursed tyrant, an enemy to God and saints, laden with all the innocent blood spilt in three kingdoms, and so to be fought against; is now, though nothing penitent or altered from his first principles, a lawful magistrate, a sovereign Lord, the Lord's anointed, not to be touched, tho' by themselves imprisoned. As if this only were obedience, to preserve the mere useless bulk of his person, and that only in prison, not in the field, and to disobey his commands, deny him his dignity and office, every where to resist his power, but where they think it only surviving in their own faction.

But who in particular is a tyrant, cannot be determined in a general discourse, otherwise than by supposition; his particular charge, and the sufficient proof of it must determine that: which I leave to magistrates, at least to the uprighter sort of them, and of the people, though in number less by many, in whom faction least hath prevailed above the law of nature and right reason, to judge as they find cause. But this I dare own as part of my faith, that if such a one there be, by whose commission, whole massacres have been committed on his faithful subjects, his provinces offered to pawn or alienation, as the hire of those whom he had solicited to come in and destroy whole cities and countries; be he king, or tyrant, or emperor, the sword of justice is above him; in whose hand soever is found sufficient power to avenge the effusion, and so great a deluge of innocent blood. For if all human power to execute, not accidentally but intendedly, the wrath of God up-

on evil-doers without exception, be of God; then that power, whether ordinary, or if that fail, extraordinary, so executing that intent of God, is lawful, and not to be resisted. But to unfold more at large this whole question, tho' with all expedient brevity, I shall here set down, from first beginning, the original of kings; how and wherefore exalted to that dignity above their brethren; and from thence shall prove, that turning to tyranny they may be as lawfully deposed and punished, as they were at first elected: this I shall do by authorities and reasons, not learnt in corners among schisms and heresies, as our doubling divines are ready to calumniate, but fetched out of the midst of choicest and most authentic learning, and no prohibited authors; nor many heathen, but mosaical, christian, orthodoxal, and which must needs be more convincing to our adversaries, presbyterial.

No man who knows aught, can be so stupid to deny that all men naturally were born free, being the image and resemblance of God himself, and were by privilege above all the creatures, born to command and not to obey: and that they lived so, till from the root of Adam's transgression, falling among themselves to do wrong and violence, and foreseeing that such courses must needs tend to the destruction of them all, they agreed by common league to bind each other from mutual injury, and jointly to defend themselves against any that gave disturbance or opposition to such agreement. Hence came cities, towns, and commonwealths. And because no faith in all was found sufficiently binding, they saw it needful to ordain some authority, that might restrain by force and punishment what was violated against peace and common right. This authority and power of self-defence and preservation being originally and naturally in every one of them, and unitedly in them all; for ease, for order, and lest each man should be his own partial judge, they communicated and derived either to one, whom for the eminence of his wisdom and integrity, they chose above the rest, or to more than one whom they thought of equal deserving: the first was called a king; the other, magistrates: not to be their lords and masters (though afterward those names in some places were given voluntarily to such as had been authors of inestimable good to the people) but to be their deputies and commissioners, to execute, by virtue of their intrusted power, that justice which else every man by the bond of nature and of covenant must have executed for himself, and for one another. And to him that shall consider well why among free persons, one man by civil right should bear authority and jurisdiction over another, no other end or reason can be imaginable. These for a while governed well, and with much equity decided all things at their own arbitrement: till the temptation of such a power left absolute in their hands, perverted them at length to injustice and partiality. Then did they who now by trial had found the danger and inconveniences of committing arbitrary power to any, invent laws either framed or consented to by all; that should confine and limit the authority of whom they chose to govern them: that so man, of whose failing they had proof, might no more rule over them, but law and reason abstracted as much as might be from personal errors and frailties. "While as the magistrate was set above the people, so the law was set above the magistrate*." When this would not serve, but that the law was either not executed, or misapplied, they were constrained from that time, the only remedy left them, to put conditions and take oaths from all kings and magistrates at their first installment to do impartial justice by law: who upon those terms and no other, received allegiance from the people, that is to say, bond or covenant to obey them in execution of those laws which they the people had themselves made or assented to. And this oft-times with express warning, that if the king or magistrate proved unfaithful to his trust, the people would be disengaged. They added also counsellors and parliaments, nor to be only at his beck, but with him or without him, at set times, or at all times, when any danger threatened, to have care of the public safety. Therefore saith Claudius Sefell, a French statesman, "The parliament was

* This sentence is omitted in the last edition.

set as a bridle to the king;" which I instance rather "not because our English lawyers have not said the same long before," but * because that French monarchy is granted by all to be a far more absolute one than ours. That this and the rest of what hath hitherto been spoken is most true, might be copiously made appear throughout all stories heathen and christian; even of those nations where kings and emperors have sought means to abolish all ancient memory of the people's right by their encroachments and usurpations. But I spare long insertions, appealing to the German, French, Italian, Arragonian, English, and not least the Scottish histories: not forgetting this only by the way, that William the Norman, though a conqueror, and not unsworn at his coronation, was compelled a second time to take oath at St. Albans, ere the people would be brought to yield obedience.

It being thus manifest that the power of kings and magistrates is nothing else, but what is only derivative, transferred and committed to them in trust from the people to the common good of them all, in whom the power yet remains fundamentally, and cannot be taken from them, without a violation of their natural birthright; and seeing that from hence Aristotle, and the best of political writers have defined a king, "him who governs to the good and profit of his people, and not for his own ends;" it follows from necessary causes, that the titles of sovereign lord, natural lord, and the like, are either arrogancies, or flatteries, not admitted by emperors and kings of best note, and disliked by the church both of Jews, (Isai. xxvi. 13.) and ancient Christians, as appears by Tertullian and others. Although generally the people of Asia, and with them the Jews also, especially since the time they chose a king, against the advice and counsel of God, are noted by wise authors much inclinable to slavery.

Secondly, that to say, as is usual, the king hath as good right to his crown and dignity, as any man to his inheritance, is to make the subject no better than the king's slave, his chattel, or his possession that may be bought and sold: and doubtless, if hereditary title were sufficiently inquired, the best foundation of it would be found but either in courtesy or convenience. But suppose it to be of right hereditary, what can be more just and legal, if a subject for certain crimes be to forfeit by law from himself and posterity, all his inheritance to the king, than that a king for crimes proportional, should forfeit all his title and inheritance to the people? Unless the people must be thought created all for him, he not for them, and they all in one body inferior to him single; which were a kind of treason against the dignity of mankind to affirm.

Thirdly, it follows, that to say kings are accountable to none but God, is the overturning of all law and government. For if they may refuse to give account, then all covenants made with them at coronation, all oaths are in vain, and mere mockeries; all laws which they swear to keep, made to no purpose: for if the king fear not God, (as how many of them do not?) we hold then our lives and estates by the tenure of his mere grace and mercy, as from a God, not a mortal magistrate; a position that none but court-parasites or men besotted would maintain! "Aristotle therefore, whom we commonly allow for one of the best interpreters of nature, and morality, writes in the fourth of his politics, chap. x. that "monarchy unaccountable, is the worst sort of tyranny; and least of all to be endured by free-born men." And surely no christian prince, not drunk with high mind, and prouder than those pagan Cæsars that deified themselves, would arrogate so unreasonably above human condition, or derogate so basely from a whole nation of men his brethren, as if for him only subsisting, and to serve his glory, valuing them in comparison of his own brute will and pleasure no more than so many beasts, or vermin under his feet, not to be reasoned with, but to be trod on; among whom there might be found so many thousand men for wisdom, virtue, nobleness of mind, and all

* This is also omitted in the last edition.

* This sentence is also entirely omitted in the last edition.

other respects but the fortune of his dignity, far above him. Yet some would persuade us that this absurd opinion was king David's, because in the li. psalm he cries out to God, "Against thee only have I sinned;" as if David had imagined that to murder Uriah and adulterate his wife had been no sin against his neighbour, whenas that law of Moses was to the king expressly, Deut. xvii. not to think so highly of himself above his brethren. David therefore by those words could mean no other, than either that the depth of his guiltiness was known to God only, or to so few as had not the will or power to question him, or that the sin against God was greater beyond compare than against Uriah. Whatever his meaning were, any wise man will see that the pathetical words of a psalm can be no certain decision to a point that hath abundantly more certain rules to go by. How much more rationally spake the Heathen king Demophoon in a tragedy of Euripides, than these interpreters would put upon king David? "I rule not my people by tyranny, as if they were barbarians, but am myself liable, if I do unjustly, to suffer justly." Not unlike was the speech of Trajan the worthy emperor, to one whom he made general of his prætorian forces: "Take this drawn sword," saith he, "to use for me, if I reign well; if not, to use against me." Thus Dion relates. And not Trajan only, but Theodosius the younger, a christian emperor, and one of the best, caused it to be enacted as a rule undeniable and fit to be acknowledged by all kings and emperors, that a prince is bound to the laws; that on the authority of law the authority of a prince depends, and to the laws ought to submit. Which edict of his remains yet unrepealed in the Code of Justinian, l. i. tit. 24. as a sacred constitution to all the succeeding emperors. How then can any king in Europe maintain and write himself accountable to none but God, when emperors in their own imperial statutes have written and decreed themselves accountable to law? And indeed where such account is not feared, he that bids a man reign over him above law, may bid as well a savage beast.

It follows, lastly, that since the king or magistrate holds his authority of the people, both originally and naturally for their good in the first place, and not his own; then may the people as oft as they shall judge it for the best, either chuse him or reject him, retain him or depose him though no tyrant, merely by the liberty and right of free-born men to be governed as seems to them best. This, though it cannot but stand with plain reason, shall be made good also by Scripture, Deut. xvii. 14. "When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shall say I will set a king over me, like as all the nations about me." These words confirm us that the right of chusing, yea of changing their own government, is by the grant of God himself in the people. And therefore when they desired a king, though then under another form of government, and though their changing displeased him, yet he that was himself their king, and rejected by them, would not be a hindrance to what they intended, further than by persuasion, but that they might do therein as they saw good, 1 Sam. viii. only he reserved to himself the nomination of who should reign over them. Neither did that exempt the king as if he were to God only accountable, though by his especial command anointed. Therefore "David first made a covenant with the elders of Israel, and so was by them anointed king," 2 Sam. v. 3. 1 Chron. xi. And Jehoiada the priest making Jehoash king, made a covenant between him and the people, 2 Kings xi. 17. Therefore when Roboam at his coming to the crown, rejected those conditions which the Israelites brought him, hear what they answer him, "What portion have we in David, or inheritance in the son of Jesse? See to thine own house David." And for the like conditions not performed, all Israel before that time deposed Samuel; not for his own default, but for the misgovernment of his sons. But some will say to both these examples, it was evilly done. I answer, that not the latter, because it was expressly allowed them in the law to set up a king if they pleased; and God himself joined with them in the work; though in some sort it was at that time displeasing to him, in respect of old Samuel who had governed them uprightly. As Livy praises the Romans who took occasion from Tarquinius a wicked prince to gain their

their liberty, which to have extorted, saith he, from Numa or any of the good kings before, had not been seasonable. Nor was it in the former example done unlawfully; for when Roboam had prepared a huge army to reduce the Israelites, he was forbidden by the prophet, 1 Kings xii. 24. "Thus saith the Lord, ye shall not go up, nor fight against your brethren, for this thing is from me." He calls them their brethren, not rebels, and forbids to be proceeded against them, owning the thing himself, not by single providence, but by approbation, and that not only of the act, as in the former example, but of the fit season also; he had not otherwise forbid to molest them. And those grave and wise counsellors whom Rehoboam first advised with, spake no such thing, as our old grey-headed flatterers now are wont, stand upon your birth-right, scorn to capitulate, you hold of God, not of them; for they knew no such matter, unless conditionally, but gave him politic council, as in a civil transaction. Therefore kingdom and magistracy, whether supreme or subordinate, is called "a human ordinance," 1 Pet. ii. 13, &c. which we are there taught is the will of God we should submit to, so far as for the punishment of evil doers, and the encouragement of them that do well. "Submit, saith he, as free men." "But to any civil power unaccountable, unquestionable, and not to be resisted, no not in wickedness, and violent actions, how can we submit as free men?" "There is no power but of God," saith Paul, Rom. xiii. as much as to say, God put it into man's heart to find out that way at first for common peace and preservation, approving the exercise thereof; else it contradicts Peter, who calls the same authority an ordinance of man. It must be also understood of lawful and just power, else we read of great power in the affairs and kingdoms of the world permitted to the devil: for saith he to Christ, Luke iv. 6. all this power will I give thee and the glory of them, for it is delivered to me, and to whomsoever I will, I give it: neither did he lye, or Christ gainsay what he affirmed; for in the thirteenth of the Revelation we read how the dragon gave to the beast his power, his seat, and great authority: which beast so authorized most expound to be the tyrannical powers and kingdoms of the earth. Therefore Saint Paul in the forecited chapter tells us, that such magistrates he means, as are not a terror to the good but to the evil, such as bear not the sword in vain, but to punish offenders, and to encourage the good. If such only be mentioned here as powers to be obeyed, and our submission to them only required, then doubtless those powers that do the contrary, are no powers ordained of God; and by consequence no obligation laid upon us to obey or not to resist them. And it may be well observed that both these Apostles, whenever they give this precept, express it in terms not concrete, but abstract, as logicians are wont to speak; that is, they mention the ordinance, the power, the authority, before the persons that execute it; and what that power is, lest we should be deceived, they describe exactly. So that if the power be not such, or the person execute not such power, neither the one nor the other is of God, but of the devil, and by consequence to be resisted. From this exposition Chrysostom also on the same place dissents not; explaining that these words were not written in behalf of a tyrant. And this is verified by David, himself a king, and likeliest to be the author of the psalm xciv. 20. which saith, "Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee?" And it were worth the knowing, since kings in these days, and that by Scripture, boast the justness of their title, by holding it immediately of God, yet cannot show the time when God ever set on the throne them or their forefathers, but only when the people chose them; why by the same reason, since God ascribes as oft to himself the casting down of princes from the throne, it should not be thought as lawful, and as much from God when none are seen to do it but the people, and that for just causes. For if it needs must be a sin in them to depose, it may as likely be a sin to have elected. And contrary, if the people's act in election be pleaded by a king, as the act of God, and the most just title to enthrone him, why may not the people's act of rejection be as well pleaded by the people as the act of God, and the most just reason to depose him? So that we see the title and just right of

* This interrogation is omitted in the last edition.

reigning or deposing in reference to God, is found in Scripture to be all one; visible only in the people, and depending merely upon justice and demerit. Thus far hath been considered chiefly the power of kings and magistrates; how it was, and is originally the people's, and by them conferred in trust only to be employed to the common peace and benefit; with liberty therefore and right remaining in them to reassume it to themselves, if by kings or magistrates it be abused; or to dispose of it by any alteration, as they shall judge most conducing to the public good.

We may from hence with more ease, and force of argument determine what a tyrant is, and what the people may do against him. A tyrant whether by wrong or by right coming to the crown, is he who regarding neither law nor the common good, reigns only for himself and his faction: Thus St. Basil among others defines him. And because his power is great, his will boundless and exorbitant, the fulfilling whereof is for the most part accompanied with innumerable wrongs and oppressions of the people, murders, massacres, rapes, adulteries, desolation, and subversion of cities and whole provinces; look how great a good and happiness a just king is, so great a mischief is a tyrant; as he the public father of his country, so this the common enemy. Against whom what the people lawfully may do, as against a common pest, and destroyer of mankind, I suppose no man of clear judgment need go further to be guided than by the very principles of nature in him. But because it is the vulgar folly of men to desert their own reason, and shutting their eyes to think they see best with other mens, I shall shew by such examples as ought to have most weight with us, what hath been done in this case heretofore. The Greeks and Romans, as their prime authors witness, held it not only lawful, but a glorious and heroic deed, rewarded publicly with statues and garlands, to kill an infamous tyrant at any time without trial: and but reason, that he who trod down all law, should not be vouchsafed the benefit of law. Insomuch that Seneca the tragedian brings in Hercules, the grand suppressor of tyrants thus speaking;

—————Victima haud ulla amplior
Poteſt, magisque opima maſtari jovi
Quam Rex iniquus—————
—————There can be ſlain
No ſacrifice to God more acceptable
Than an unjuſt and wicked king—————

But of theſe I name no more, leſt it be objected they were Heathen; and come to produce another ſort of men that had the knowledge of true religion. Among the Jews this cuſtom of tyrant-killing was not unuſual. Firſt Ehud, a man whom God had raiſed to deliver Iſrael from Eglon king of Moab, who had conquered and ruled over them eighteen years, being ſent to him as an ambaffador with a preſent, ſlew him in his own houſe. But he was a foreign prince, an enemy, and Ehud beſides had ſpecial warrant from God. To the firſt I anſwer, it imports not whether foreign or native: For no prince ſo native but profeſſes to hold by law; which when he himſelf overturns, breaking all the covenants and oaths that gave him title to his dignity, and were the bond and alliance between him and his people, what differs he from an outlandiſh king or from an enemy? For look how much right the king of Spain hath to govern us at all, ſo much right hath the king of England to govern us tyrannically. If he, though not bound to us by any league, coming from Spain in perſon to ſubdue us, or to deſtroy us, might lawfully by the people of England either be ſlain in fight, or put to death in captivity, what hath a native king to plead, bound by ſo many covenants, benefits and honours to the welfare of his people; why he through the contempt of all laws and parliaments, the only tie of our obedience to him, for his own will's ſake, and a boated prerogative unaccountable, after ſeven years warring and deſtroying of his beſt ſubjects, overcome, and yielded

yielded prisoner, should think to scape unquestionable, as a thing divine, in respect of whom so many thousand christians destroyed should lie unaccounted for, polluting with their slaughtered carcasses all the land over, and crying for vengeance against the living that should have righted them? Who knows not that there is a mutual bond of amity and brotherhood between man and man over all the world, neither is it the English sea that can sever us from that duty and relation: a straighter bond yet there is between fellow-subjects, neighbours, and friends. But when any of these do one to another so as hostility could do no worse, what doth the law decree less against them, than open enemies and invaders? or if the law be not present or too weak, what doth it warrant us to less than single defence or civil war? and from that time forward the law of civil defensive war differs nothing from the law of foreign hostility. Nor is it distance of place that makes enmity, but enmity that makes distance. He therefore that keeps peace with me, near or remote, of whatsoever nation, is to me as far as all civil and human offices an Englishman and a neighbour: but if an Englishman forgetting all laws, human, civil, and religious, offend against life and liberty, to him offended and to the law in his behalf, though born in the same womb, he is no better than a Turk, a Saracen, a Heathen. This is gospel, and this was ever law among equals; how much rather then in force against any king whatever, who in respect of the people is confessed inferior and not equal: to distinguish therefore of a tyrant by outlandish, or domestic, is a weak evasion. To the second, that he was an enemy; I answer, what tyrant is not? yet Eglon by the Jews had been acknowledged as their sovereign, they had served him eighteen years, as long almost as we our William the conqueror, in all which he could not be so unwise a statesman but to have taken of them oaths of fealty and allegiance; by which they made themselves his proper subjects, as their homage and present sent by Ehud testified. To the third, that he had special warrant to kill Eglon in that manner, it cannot be granted, because not expressed; it is plain that he was raised by God to be a deliverer, and went on just principles, such as were then and ever held allowable to deal so by a tyrant that could no otherwise be dealt with. Neither did Samuel, though a prophet, with his own hand abstain from Agag; a foreign enemy, no doubt; but mark the reason, "As thy sword hath made women childless;" a cause that by the sentence of law itself nullifies all relations. And as the law is between brother and brother, father and son, master and servant, wherefore not between king or rather tyrant and people? And whereas Jehu had special command to slay Jehoram a successive and hereditary tyrant, it seems not the less imitable for that; for where a thing grounded so much on natural reason hath the addition of a command from God, what does it but establish the lawfulness of such an act? Nor is it likely that God, who had so many ways of punishing the house of Ahab, would have sent a subject against his prince, if the fact in itself, as done to a tyrant, had been of bad example. And if David refused to lift his hand against the Lord's anointed, the matter between them was not tyranny, but private enmity, and David as a private person had been his own revenger, not so much the people's: but when any tyrant at this day can shew himself to be the Lord's anointed, the only mentioned reason why David withheld his hand, he may then, but not till then, presume on the same privilege.

We may pass therefore hence to christian times. And first our Saviour himself, how much he favoured tyrants, and how much intended they should be found or honoured among christians, declares his mind not obscurely; accounting their absolute authority no better than Gentilism, yea though they flourished it over with the splendid name of benefactors; charging those that would be his disciples to usurp no such dominion; but that they who were to be of most authority among them, should esteem themselves ministers and servants to the public. Mat. xx. 25. "The princes of the gentiles exercise lordship over them," and Mark x. 42. "They that seem to rule," saith he, either slighting or accounting them no lawful rulers; "but ye shall not be so, but the greatest among you shall be your servant." And although he himself

were

were the meekest, and came on earth to be so, yet to a tyrant we hear him not vouchsafe an humble word: but "Tell that fox," Luke xiii. * "So far we ought to be from thinking that Christ and his gospel should be made a sanctuary for tyrants from justice, to whom his law before never gave such protection." And wherefore did his mother the virgin Mary give such praise to God in her prophetic song, that he had now by the coming of Christ, cut down Dynasta's, or proud monarchs from the throne, if the church, when God manifests his power in them to do so, should rather choose all misery and vassalage to serve them, and let them still sit on their potent seats to be adored for doing mischief? Surely it is not for nothing that tyrants by a kind of natural instinct both hate and fear none more than the true church and saints of God, as the most dangerous enemies and subverters of monarchy, though indeed of tyranny; hath not this been the perpetual cry of courtiers, and court-prelates? whereof no likelier cause can be alledged, but that they well discerned the mind and principles of most devout and zealous men, and indeed the very discipline of church, tending to the dissolution of all tyranny. No marvel then if since the faith of Christ received, in purer or impurer times, to depose a king and put him to death for tyranny, hath been accounted so just and requisite, that neighbour kings have both upheld and taken part with subjects in the action. And Ludovicus Pius, himself an emperor, and Son of Charles the Great, being made judge (Du Haillan is my author) between Milegast king of the Vultzes and his subjects who had deposed him, gave his verdict for the subjects, and for him whom they had chosen in his room. Note here, that the right of electing whom they please, is by the impartial testimony of an emperor in the people: For, said he, "A just prince ought to be preferred before an unjust, and the end of government before the prerogative." And Constantinus Leo, another emperor, in the Byzantine laws saith, "That the end of a king is for the general good, which he not performing, is but the counterfeit of a king." And to prove that some of our own monarchs have acknowledged that their high office exempted them not from punishment, they had the sword of St. Edward borne before them by an officer who was called earl of the palace, even at the times of their highest pomp and solemnities; to mind them, saith Matthew Paris, the best of our historians, "that if they erred, the sword had power to restrain them." And what restraint the sword comes to at length, having both edge and point, if any Sceptic will doubt, let him feel. It is also affirmed from diligent search made in our ancient books of law, that the peers and barons of England had a legal right to judge the king: which was the cause most likely, (for it could be no slight cause,) that they were called his peers, or equals. This however may stand immovable, so long as man hath to deal with no better than man; that if our law judge all men to the lowest by their peers, it should in all equity ascend also, and judge the highest. And so much I find both in our own and foreign story, that dukes, earls, and marquesses were at first not hereditary, not empty and vain titles, but names of trust and office, and with the office ceasing; as induces me to be of opinion, that every worthy man in parliament, (for the word baron imports no more,) might for the public good be thought a fit peer and judge of the king; without regard had to petty caveats, and circumstances, the chief impediment in high affairs, and ever stood upon most by circumstantial men. Whence doubtless our ancestors, who were not ignorant with what rights either nature or ancient constitution had endowed them; when oaths both at coronation, and renewed in parliament would not serve, thought it no way illegal to depose and put to death their tyrannous kings. Insomuch that the parliament drew up a charge against Richard the Second, and the commons requested to have judgment decreed against him, that the realm might not be endangered. And Peter Martyr, a divine of foremost rank, on the third of Judges approves their doings. Sir Thomas Smith also, a protestant and a statesman, in his commonwealth of England, putting the question, "whether it be lawful to rise against a tyrant?" answers, "that the vulgar judge of it according to the event, and the

* This sentence is omitted in the last edition.

learned according to the purpose of them that do it." But far before those days Gildas, the most ancient of all our historians, speaking of those times wherein the Roman empire decaying, quitted and relinquished what right they had by conquest to this island, and resigned it all into the people's hands, testifies that the people thus re-invested with their own original right, about the year 446, both elected them kings, whom they thought best (the first christian British kings that ever reigned here since the Romans) and by the same right, when they apprehended cause, usually deposed and put them to death. This is the most fundamental and ancient tenure that any king of England can produce or pretend to; in comparison of which, all other titles and pleas are but of yesterday. If any object that Gildas condemns the Britons for so doing, the answer is as ready; that he condemns them no more for so doing, than he did before for chusing such; for saith he, "They anointed them kings, not of God, but such as were more bloody than the rest." Next, he condemns them not at all for deposing or putting them to death, but for doing it over-hastily, without trial or well examining the cause, and for electing others worse in their room. Thus we have here both domestic and most ancient examples that the people of Britain have deposed and put to death their kings in those primitive christian times. And to couple reason with example, if the Church in all ages, primitive, Romish, or protestant, held it ever no less their duty than the power of their keys, though without express warrant of Scripture, to bring indifferently both king and peasant under the utmost rigour of their canons and censures ecclesiastical, even to the smiting him with a final excommunication, if he persist impenitent; what hinders but that the temporal law both may and ought, though without a special text or precedent, extend with like indifference the civil sword, to the cutting off, without exemption, him that capitally offends, seeing that justice and religion are from the same God, and works of justice oft-times more acceptable? Yet because that some lately with the tongues and arguments of malignant backsliders have written that the proceedings now in parliament against the king, are without precedent from any protestant state or kingdom, the examples which follow shall be all protestant, and chiefly presbyterian.

In the year 1546, the Duke of Saxony, Landgrave of Hesse, and the whole protestant league, raised open war against Charles the Fifth their emperor, sent him a defiance, renounced all faith and allegiance toward him, and debated long in council whether they should give him so much as the title of Cæsar. Sleidan. l. 17. Let all men judge what this wanted of deposing or of killing, but the power to do it.

In the year 1559, the Scots protestants claiming promise of their Queen-regent for liberty of conscience, she answering that promises were not to be claimed of princes beyond what was commodious for them to grant, told her to her face in the parliament then at Sterling, that if it were so, they renounced their obedience; and soon after betook them to arms. Buchanan Hist. l. 16. Certainly when allegiance is renounced, that very hour the king or queen is in effect deposed.

In the year 1564, John Knox a most famous divine, and the reformer of Scotland to the presbyterian discipline, at a general assembly maintained openly in a dispute against Lethington the secretary of state, that subjects might and ought to execute God's judgments upon their king; that the fact of Jehu and others against their king, having the ground of God's ordinary command to put such and such offenders to death, was not extraordinary, but to be imitated of all that preferred the honour of God to the affection of flesh and wicked princes; that kings, if they offend, have no privilege to be exempted from the punishments of law more than any other subject: so that if the king be a murderer, adulterer, or idolater, he should suffer, not as a king, but as an offender; and this position he repeats again and again before them. Answerable was the opinion of John Craig another learned divine, and that laws made by the tyranny of princes, or the negligence of people, their posterity might abrogate, and reform all things according to the original institution of commonwealths. And Knox being commanded by the nobility to
write

write to Calvin and other learned men for their judgments in that question, refused; alledging that both himself was fully resolved in conscience, and had heard their judgments, and had the same opinion under hand-writing of many the most godly and most learned that he knew in Europe; that if he should move the question to them again, what should he do but shew his own forgetfulness or inconstancy? All this is far more largely in the ecclesiastic history of Scotland, l. 4. with many other passages to this effect all the book over, set out with diligence by Scotsmen of best repute among them at the beginning of these troubles; as if they laboured to inform us what we were to do, and what they intended upon the like occasion.

And to let the world know that the whole Church and protestant state of Scotland in those purest times of reformation were of the same belief, three years after, they met in the field Mary their lawful and hereditary queen, took her prisoner, yielding before fight, kept her in prison, and the same year deposed her. Buchan. Hist. l. 18.

And four years after that, the Scots in justification of their deposing queen Mary, sent ambassadors to queen Elizabeth, and in a written declaration alledged that they had used towards her more lenity than she deserved; that their ancestors had heretofore punished their kings by death or banishment; that the Scots were a free nation, made king whom they freely chose, and with the same freedom un-kinged him if they saw cause, by right of ancient laws and ceremonies yet remaining, and old customs yet among the highlanders in chusing the head of their clans, or families; all which, with many other arguments, bore witness that regal power was nothing else but a mutual covenant or stipulation between king and people. Buch. Hist. l. 20. These were Scotsmen and Presbyterians: but what measure then have they lately offered, to think such liberty less befitting us than themselves, presuming to put him upon us for a master, whom their law scarce allows to be their own equal? If now then we hear them in another strain than heretofore in the purest times of their Church, we may be confident it is the voice of faction speaking in them, not of truth and reformation. * "Which no less in England than in Scotland, by the mouths of those faithful witnesses commonly called puritans and non-conformists, spake as clearly for the putting down, yea the utmost punishing of kings, as in their several treatises may be read; even from the first reign of Elizabeth to these times. Insomuch that one of them, whose name was Gibson foretold king James, he should be rooted out, and conclude his race, if he persisted to uphold bishops. And that very inscription, stamped upon the first coins at his coronation, a naked sword in a hand with these words, "Si mereor, in me," "against me, if I deserve," not only manifested the judgment of that state, but seemed also to presage the sentence of divine justice in this event upon his son."

In the year 1581, the states of Holland, in a general assembly at the Hague, abjured all obedience and subjection to Philip king of Spain; and in a declaration justify their so doing; for that by his tyrannous government, against faith so many times given and broken, he had lost his right to all the Belgic provinces; that therefore they deposed him, and declared it lawful to chuse another in his stead. Thuan. l. 74. From that time to this, no state or kingdom in the world hath equally prospered: But let them remember not to look with an evil and prejudicial eye upon their neighbours walking by the same rule.

But what need these examples to presbyterians, I mean to those who now of late would seem so much to abhor deposing, whenas they to all christendom have given the latest and the liveliest example of doing it themselves. I question not the lawfulness of raising war against a tyrant in defence of religion, or civil liberty; for no protestant Church from the first Waldenses of Lyons and Languedoc to this day, but have done it round, and maintained it lawful. But this I doubt not to affirm, that the presbyterians, who now so much condemn deposing, were the men themselves that deposed the king, and cannot

* All this was omitted in the last edition.

with all their shifting and relapsing, wash off the guiltiness from their own hands. For they themselves, by these their late doings have made it guiltiness, and turned their own warrantable actions into rebellion.

There is nothing that so actually makes a king of England, as rightful possession and supremacy in all Causes both Civil and Ecclesiastical : and nothing that so actually makes a subject of England, as those two oaths of allegiance and supremacy observed without equivocating, or any mental reservation. Out of doubt then when the king shall command things already constituted in church or state, obedience is the true essence of a subject, either to do, if it be lawful, or if he hold the thing unlawful, to submit to that penalty which the law imposes, so long as he intends to remain a subject. Therefore when the people, or any part of them, shall rise against the king and his authority, executing the law in any thing established, civil or ecclesiastical, I do not say it is rebellion, if the thing commanded though established be unlawful, and that they sought first all due means of redress (and no man is further bound to law) but I say it is an absolute renouncing both of supremacy and allegiance, which in one word is an actual and total deposing of the king, and the setting up of another supreme authority over them. And whether the presbyterians have not done all this and much more, they will not put me, I suppose, to reckon up a seven years story fresh in the memory of all men. Have they not utterly broke the oath of allegiance, rejecting the king's command and authority sent them from any part of the kingdom whether in things lawful or unlawful ? Have they not abjured the oath of supremacy, by setting up the parliament without the king, supreme to all their obedience ; and though their vow and covenant bound them in general to the parliament, yet sometimes adhering to the lesser part of lords and commons that remained faithful, as they term it, and even of them, one while to the commons without the lords, another while to the lords without the commons ? Have they not still declared their meaning, whatever their oath were, to hold them only for supreme whom they found at any time most yielding to what they petitioned ? Both these oaths, which were the straightest bond of an English subject in reference to the king, being thus broke and made void ; it follows undeniably that the king from that time was by them in fact absolutely deposed, and they no longer in reality to be thought his subjects, notwithstanding their fine clause in the covenant to preserve his person, crown and dignity, set there by some dodging casuist with more craft than sincerity, to mitigate the matter in case of ill success, and not taken I suppose by any honest man, but as a condition subordinate to every the least particle that might more concern religion, liberty, or the public peace.

To prove it yet more plainly that they are the men who have deposed the king, I thus argue. We know that king and subject are relatives, and relatives have no longer being than in the relation ; the relation between king and subject can be no other than regal authority and subjection. Hence I infer past their defending, that if the subject who is one relative, take away the relation, of force he takes away also the other relative : but the presbyterians who were one relative, that is to say, subjects, have for this seven years taken away the relation ; that is to say the king's authority, and their subjection to it ; therefore the presbyterians for these seven years have removed and extinguished the other relative, that is to say the king ; or to speak more in brief, have deposed him ; not only by depriving him the execution of his authority, but by conferring it upon others. If then their oaths of subjection broken, new supremacy obeyed, new oaths and covenant taken, notwithstanding frivolous evasions, have in plain terms unkinged the king, much more then hath their seven years war, not deposed him only, but outlawed him, and defied him as an alien, a rebel to law, and enemy to the state. It must needs be clear to any man not averse from reason, that hostility and subjection are two direct and positive contraries, and can no more in one subject stand together in respect of the same king, than one person at the same time can be in two remote places. Against whom therefore the subject is in act of hostility, we may be confident that to him he is in no subjection : and in whom

hostility takes place of subjection, for they can by no means consist together, to him the king can be not only no king, but an enemy. So that from hence we shall not need dispute whether they have deposed him, or what they have defaulted towards him as no king, but shew manifestly how much they have done toward the killing him. Have they not levied all these wars against him whether offensive or defensive (for defence in war equally offends, and most prudently before-hand) and given commission to slay where they knew his person could not be exempt from danger? And if chance or flight had not saved him, how often had they killed him, directing their artillery without blame or prohibition, to the very place where they saw him stand? Have they not sequestred him, judged or unjudged, and converted his revenue to other uses, detaining from him, as a grand delinquent, all means of livelihood, so that for them long since he might have perished, or have starved? Have they not hunted and pursued him round about the kingdom with sword and fire? Have they not formerly denied to treat with him, and their now recanting ministers preached against him, as a reprobate incurable, an enemy to God and his church, marked for destruction, and therefore not to be treated with? Have they not besieged him, and to their power forbid him water and fire, save what they shot against him to the hazard of his life? Yet while they thus assaulted and endangered it with hostile deeds, they swore in words to defend it with his crown and dignity; not in order, as it seems now, to a firm and lasting peace, or to his repentance after all this blood; but simply, wit out regard, without remorse or any comparable value of all the miseries and calamities suffered by the poor people, or to suffer hereafter through his obstinacy or impenitence. No understanding man can be ignorant that covenants are ever made according to the present state of persons and of things; and have ever the more general laws of nature and of reason included in them, though not expressed. If I make a voluntary covenant as with a man to do him good, and he prove afterward a monster to me, I should conceive a disobligement. If I covenant, not to hurt an enemy, in favour of him and forbearance, and hope of his amendment, and he, after that, shall do me tenfold injury and mischief to what he had done when I so covenanted, and still be plotting what may tend to my destruction, I question not but that his after-actions release me; nor know I covenant so sacred that withholds me from demanding justice on him. Howbeit, had not their distrust in a good cause, and the fast and loose of our prevaricating divines over-ruled, it had been doubtless better, not to have inserted in a covenant unnecessary obligations, and words, not works of supererogating allegiance to their enemy; no way advantageous to themselves, had the king prevailed, as to their cost many would have felt; but full of snare and distraction to our friends, useful only, as we now find, to our adversaries, who under such a latitude and shelter of ambiguous interpretation have ever since been plotting and contriving new opportunities to trouble all again. How much better had it been, and more becoming an undaunted virtue, to have declared openly and boldly whom and what power the people were to hold supreme, as on the like occasion protestants have done before, and many conscientious men now in these times have more than once besought the parliament to do, that they might go on upon a sure foundation, and not with a ridling covenant in their mouths, seeming to swear counter, almost in the same breath, allegiance and no allegiance; which doubtless had drawn off all the minds of sincere men from siding with them, had they not discerned their actions far more deposing him than their words upholding him; which words made now the subject of cavillous interpretations, stood ever in the covenant, by judgment of the more discerning sort, an evidence of their fear, not of their fidelity. What should I return to speak on, of those attempts for which the king himself hath often charged the presbyterians of seeking his life, whenas in the due estimation of things they might without a fallacy be said to have done the deed outright? Who knows not that the king is a name of dignity and office, not of person? Who therefore kills a king, must kill him while he is a king. Then they certainly who by deposing him have long since taken from

from him the life of a king, his office and his dignity, they in the truest sense may be said to have killed the king: not only by their deposing and waging war against him, which besides the danger to his personal life, set him in the farthest opposite point from any vital function of a king, but by their holding him in prison, vanquished and yielded into their absolute and despotic power, which brought him to the lowest degradation and incapacity of the regal name. I say not, by whose matchless valour next under God, left the story of their ingratitude thereupon carry me from the purpose in hand, which is to convince them that they, which I repeat again, were the men who in the truest sense killed the king, not only as is proved before, but by depressing him their king far below the rank of a subject to the condition of a captive, without intention to restore him, as the chancellor of Scotland in a speech told him plainly at Newcastle, unless he granted fully all their demands, which they knew he never meant. Nor did they treat, or think of treating with him, till their hatred to the army that delivered them, not their love or duty to the king, joined them secretly with men sentenced so oft for reprobates in their own mouths, by whose suttile inspiring they grew mad upon a most tardy and improper treaty. Whereas if the whole bent of their actions had not been against the king himself, but only against his evil counsellors, as they feigned, and published, wherefore did they not restore him all that while to the true life of a king, his office, crown and dignity, when he was in their power, and they themselves his nearest counsellors? The truth therefore is, both that they would not, and that indeed they could not without their own certain destruction, having reduced him to such a final pass, as was the very death and burial of all in him that was regal, and from whence never king of England yet revived, but by the new re-inforcement of his own party, which was a kind of resurrection to him. Thus having quite extinguished all that could be in him of a king, and from a total privation clad him over, like another specifical thing, with forms and habitudes destructive to the former, they left in his person dead as to law and all the civil right either of king or subject, the life only of a prisoner, a captive and a malefactor: Whom the equal and impartial hand of justice finding, was no more to spare than another ordinary man; not only made obnoxious to the doom of law by a charge more than once drawn up against him, and his own confession to the first article at Newport, but summoned and arraigned in the sight of God and his people, cursed and devoted to perdition worse than any Ahab, or Antiochus, with exhortation to curse all those in the name of God that made not war against him, as bitterly as Meroz was to be cursed, that went not out against a Canaanitish king, almost in all the sermons, prayers, and fulminations that have been uttered this seven years by those cloven tongues of falshood and dissension, who now, to the stirring up of new discord, acquit him; and against their own discipline, which they boast to be the throne and scepter of Christ, absolve him, unconfound him, though unconverted, unrepentant, unsensible of all their precious saints and martyrs whose blood they have so oft laid upon his head: and now again with a new sovereign anointment can wash it all off, as if it were as vile, and no more to be reckoned for than the blood of so many dogs in a time of pestilence: giving the most opprobrious lie to all the acted zeal that for these many years hath filled their bellies, and fed them fat upon the foolish people. Ministers of sedition, not of the gospel, who while they saw it manifestly tend to civil war and bloodshed, never ceased exasperating the people against him; and now that they see it likely to breed new commotion, cease not to incite others against the people that have saved them from him, as if sedition were their only aim, whether against him or for him. But God, as we have cause to trust, will put other thoughts into the people, and turn them from giving ear or heed to these mercenary noise-makers, of whose fury and false prophecies, we have enough experience; and from the murmurs of new discord will incline them to hearken rather with erected minds to the voice of our supreme magistracy, calling us to liberty, and the flourishing deeds of a reformed commonwealth; with this hope,

that as God was heretofore angry with the Jews who rejected him and his form of government to chuse a king, so that he will bless us, and be propitious to us who reject a king to make him only our leader, and supreme governor in the conformity as near as may be of his own ancient government; if we have at least but so much worth in us to entertain the sense of our future happiness, and the courage to receive what God vouchsafes us: wherein we have the honour to precede other nations, who are now labouring to be our followers. For as to this question in hand, what the people by their just right may do in change of government, or of governor, we see it cleared sufficiently; besides other ample authority, even from the mouths of princes themselves. And surely they that shall boast, as we do, to be a free nation, and not have in themselves the power to remove, or to abolish any governor supreme, or subordinate, with the government itself upon urgent causes, may please their fancy with a ridiculous and painted freedom, fit to cozen babies; but are indeed under tyranny and servitude; as wanting that power, which is the root and source of all liberty, to dispose and oeconomize in the land which God hath given them, as masters of family in their own house and free inheritance. Without which natural and essential power of a free nation, though bearing high their heads, they can in due esteem be thought no better than slaves and vassals born, in the tenure and occupation of another inheriting Lord. Whose government, though not illegal, or intolerable, hangs over them as a lordly scourge, not as a free government; and therefore to be abrogated. How much more justly then may they sling off tyranny, or tyrants; who being once deposed can be no more than private men, as subject to the reach of justice and arraignment as any other transgressors? And certainly if men, not to speak of heathen, both wise and religious, have done justice upon tyrants what way they could soonest, how much more mild and humane then is it, to give them fair and open trial; to teach lawless kings, and all who so much adore them, that not mortal man, or his imperious will, but justice is the only true sovereign and supreme majesty upon earth? Let men cease therefore out of faction and hypocrisy, to make outcries and horrid things of things so just and honourable. * “Though perhaps till now, no protestant state or kingdom can be alledged to have openly put to death their king, which lately some have written, and imputed to their great glory; much mistaking the matter. It is not, neither ought to be the glory of a protestant state, never to have put their king to death; it is the glory of a protestant king never to have deserved death.” And if the parliament and military council do what they do without precedent, if it appear their duty, it argues the more wisdom, virtue, and magnanimity, that they know themselves able to be a precedent to others. Who perhaps in future ages, if they prove not too degenerate, will look up with honour, and aspire toward these exemplary and matchless deeds of their ancestors, as to the highest top of their civil glory and emulation. Which heretofore in the pursuance of fame and foreign dominion, spent itself vain-gloriously abroad; but henceforth may learn a better fortitude, to dare execute highest justice on them that shall by force of arms endeavour the oppressing and bereaving of religion and their liberty at home: that no unbridled potentate or tyrant, but to his sorrow for the future, may presume such high and irresponsible licence over mankind, to havoc and turn upside-down whole kingdoms of men, as though they were no more in respect of his perverse will than a nation of pismires. As for the party called presbyterian, of whom I believe very many to be good and faithful christians, though misled by some of turbulent spirit, I wish them earnestly and calmly not to fall off from their first principles, nor to affect rigour and superiority over men not under them; not to compel unforcible things, in religion especially, which if not voluntary, becomes a sin; nor to assist the clamour and malicious drifts of men whom they themselves have judged to be the worst of men, the obdurate enemies of God and his church: nor to dart against the actions of their brethren, for want of

* This is also omitted in the last edition.

other argument, those wrested laws and scriptures thrown by prelates and malignants against their own sides, which though they hurt not otherwise, yet taken up by them to the condemnation of their own doings, give scandal to all men, and discover in themselves either extreme passion or apostacy. Let them not oppose their best friends and associates, who molest them not at all, infringe not the least of their liberties, unless they call it their liberty to bind other mens consciences, but are still seeking to live at peace with them and brotherly accord. Let them beware an old and perfect enemy, who though he hope by sowing discord to make them his instruments, yet cannot forbear a minute the open threatening of his destined revenge upon them, when they have served his purposes. Let them fear therefore, if they be wise, rather what they have done already, than what remains to do, and be warned in time they put no confidence in princes whom they have provoked, lest they be added to the examples of those that miserably have tasted the event. Stories can inform them how Christiern the IId, King of Denmark, not much above a hundred years past, driven out by his subjects, and received again upon new oaths and conditions, broke through them all to his most bloody revenge; slaying his chief opposers when he saw his time, both them and their children invited to a feast for that purpose. How Maximilian dealt with those of Bruges, though by mediation of the German princes reconciled to them by solemn and public writings drawn and sealed. How the massacre at Paris was the effect of that credulous peace which the French protestants made with Charles the IXth their king: and that the main visible cause which to this day hath saved the Netherlands from utter ruin, was their final not believing the perfidious cruelty which as a constant maxim of state hath been used by the Spanish kings on their subjects that have taken arms and after trusted them; as no latter age but can testify, heretofore in Belgia itself, and this very year in Naples. And to conclude with one past exception, though far more ancient, David whose sanctified prudence might be alone sufficient, not to warrant us only, but to instruct us, when once he had taken arms, never after that trusted Saul, though with tears and much relenting he twice promised not to hurt him. These instances, few of many, might admonish them, both English and Scotch, not to let their own ends, and the driving on of a faction, betray them blindly into the snare of those enemies whose revenge looks on them as the men who first begun, fomented, and carried on beyond the cure of any sound or safe accommodation, all the evil which hath since unavoidably befallen them and their king.

I have something also to the divines, though brief to what were needful; not to be disturbers of the civil affairs, being in hands better able and more belonging to manage them; but to study harder, and to attend the office of good pastors, knowing that he whose flock is least among them, hath a dreadful charge, not performed by mounting twice into the chair with a formal preachment huddled up at the odd hours of a whole lazy week, but by incessant pains and watching in season and out of season, from house to house, over the souls of whom they have to feed. Which if they ever well considered, how little leisure would they find to be the most pragmatical sidersmen of every popular tumult and sedition? And all this while are to learn what the true end and reason is of the gospel which they teach; and what a world it differs from the censorious and supercilious lording over conscience. It would be good also they lived so as might persuade the people they hated covetousness, which worse than heresy, is idolatry; hated pluralities, and all kind of Simony; lest rambling from benefice to benefice, like ravenous wolves seeking where they may devour the biggest. Of which if some, well and warmly seated from the beginning, be not guilty, it were good they held not conversation with such as are: let them be sorry that being called to assemble about reforming the church, they fell to propping and soliciting the parliament, though they had renounced the name of priests, for a new settling of their tithes and oblations; and double lined themselves with spiritual places of commodity beyond the possible discharge of their duty.

duty. Let them assemble in consistory with their elders and deacons, according to ancient ecclesiastical rule, to the preserving of church-discipline, each in his several charge, and not a pack of clergymen by themselves to belly-cheer in their presumptuous Sion, or to promote designs, abuse and gull the simple laity, and stir up tumult, as the prelates did, for the maintenance of their pride and avarice. These things if they observe, and wait with patience, no doubt but all things will go well without their importunities or exclamations: and the printed letters which they send subscribed with the ostentation of great characters and little moment, would be more considerable than now they are. But if they be the ministers of mammon instead of Christ, and scandalize his church with the filthy love of gain, aspiring also to sit the closest and the heaviest of all tyrants, upon the conscience, and fall notoriously into the same sins, whereof so lately and so loud they accused the prelates; as God rooted out those wicked ones immediately before, so will he root out them their imitators: and to vindicate his own glory and religion, will uncover their hypocrisy to the open world; and visit upon their own heads that "curse ye Meroz," the very Motto of their pulpits, wherewith so frequently, not as Meroz, but more like atheists, they have blasphemed the vengeance of God, and traduced the zeal of his people.

"* And that they be not what they go for, true ministers of the protestant doctrine, taught by those abroad, famous and religious men, who first reformed the church, or by those no less zealous, who withstood corruption and the bishops here at home, branded with the name of puritans and nonconformists, we shall abound with testimonies to make appear: that men may yet more fully know the difference between protestant divines, and these pulpit-firebrands.

Luther. Lib. contra rusticos apud Sleidan. l. 5.

Is est hodie rerum status, &c. "Such is the state of things at this day, that men neither can, nor will, nor indeed ought to endure longer the domination of you princes."

Neque vero Cæsarem, &c. "Neither is Cæsar to make war as head of Christendom, protector of the church, defender of the faith; these titles being false and windy, and most kings being the greatest enemies to religion." Lib. de bello contra turcas. apud Sleid. l. 14. What hinders then, but that we may depose or punish them?

These also are recited by Cochläus in his Miscellanies to be the words of Luther, or some other eminent divine, then in Germany, when the protestants there entered into solemn covenant at Smalcaldia. Ut ora iis obturem, &c. "That I may stop their mouths, the pope and emperor are not born but elected, and may also be deposed as hath been often done." If Luther, or whoever else thought so, he could not stay there; for the right of birth or succession can be no privilege in nature to let a tyrant sit irremovable over a nation free born, without transforming that nation from the nature and condition of men born free, into natural, hereditary, and successive slaves. Therefore he saith further; "To displace and throw down this Exactor, this Phalaris, this Nero, is a work pleasing to God;" namely, for being such a one: which is a moral reason. Shall then so slight a consideration as his hap to be not elective simply, but by birth, which was a meer accident, overthrow that which is moral, and make displeasing to God that which otherwise had so well pleased him? Certainly not: for if the matter be rightly argued, election much rather than chance, binds a man to content himself with what he suffers by his own bad election. Though indeed neither the one nor other binds any man, much less any people to a necessary sufferance of those wrongs and evils, which they have ability and strength enough given them to remove.

* All that follows, to the end of this tract, marked with inverted comma's, was left out not only in the last edition, printed 1738, in 2 vols. folio; but in that of Mr. Toland, who first collected the author's works: how this omission arose, the reader will see in a note at the beginning of this tract, Page 341.

Zwinglius. tom. i. articul. 42.

Quando vero perfidè, &c. "When kings reign perfidiously, and against the rule of Christ, they may according to the word of God be deposed."

Mihi ergo compertum non est, &c. "I know not how it comes to pass that kings reign by succession, unless it be with consent of the whole people." *ibid.*

Quum vero consensu, &c. "But when by suffrage and consent of the whole people, or the better part of them, a tyrant is deposed or put to death, God is the chief leader in that action." *ibid.*

Nunc cum tam tepidi sumus, &c. "Now that we are so lukewarm in upholding publick justice, we indure the vices of tyrants to reign now a days with impunity; justly therefore by them we are trod underfoot, and shall at length with them be punished. Yet ways are not wanting by which tyrants may be removed, but there wants publick justice." *ibid.*

Cavete vobis ô tyranni. "Beware ye tyrants! for now the gospel of Jesus Christ spreading far and wide, will renew the lives of many to love innocence and justice; which if ye also shall do, ye shall be honoured. But if ye shall go on to rage and do violence, ye shall be trampled on by all men." *ibid.*

Romanum imperium imò quodque, &c. "When the Roman empire or any other shall begin to oppress religion, and we negligently suffer it, we are as much guilty of religion so violated, as the oppressors themselves." *Idem Epist. ad Conrad. Somium.*

Calvin on Daniel. c. iv. v. 25.

Hodie Monarchæ semper in suis titulis, &c. "Now a days monarchs pretend always in their titles, to be kings by the grace of God: but how many of them to this end only pretend it, that they may reign without controul; for to what purpose is the grace of God mentioned in the title of kings, but that they may acknowledge no superior? In the mean while God, whose name they use, to support themselves, they willingly would tread under their feet. It is therefore a meer cheat when they boast to reign by the grace of God."

Abdicant se terreni principes, &c. "Earthly princes depose themselves while they rise against God, yea they are unworthy to be numbered among men: rather it behoves us to spit upon their heads than to obey them." *On Dan. c. vi. v. 22.*

Bucer on Matth. c. v.

Si princeps superior, &c. "If a sovereign prince endeavour by arms to defend transgressors, to subvert those things which are taught in the word of God, they who are in authority under him, ought first to dissuade him; if they prevail not, and that he now bears himself not as a prince, but as an enemy, and seeks to violate privileges and rights granted to inferior magistrates or commonalties, it is the part of pious magistrates, imploring first the assistance of God, rather to try all ways and means, than to betray the flock of Christ, to such an enemy of God: for they also are to this end ordained, that they may defend the people of God, and maintain those things which are good and just. For to have supreme power lessens not the evil committed by that power, but makes it the less tolerable, by how much the more generally hurtful. Then certainly the less tolerable, the more unpardonably to be punished."

Of Peter Martyr we have spoke before.

Paræus in Rom. xiii.

Quorum est constituere magistratus, &c. "They whose part is to set up magistrates, may restrain them also from outrageous deeds, or pull them down; but all magistrates
are

are set up either by parliament or by electors, or by other magistrates; they therefore who exalted them, may lawfully degrade and punish them."

"Of the Scots divines I need not mention others than the famousst among them, Knox, and his fellow labourers in the reformation of Scotland; whose large treatises on this subject, defend the same opinion. To cite them sufficiently, were to insert their whole books, written purposely on this argument. "Knox's Appeal;" and to the reader; where he promises in a postscript that the book which he intended to set forth, called "The second blast of the trumpet," should maintain more at large, that the same men most justly may depose, and punish him whom unadvisedly they have elected, notwithstanding birth, succession, or any oath of allegiance. Among our own divines, Cartwright and Fenner, two of the learnedest, may in reason satisfy us what was held by the rest. Fenner in his book of Theology maintaining, that they who have power, that is to say a parliament, may either by fair means or by force depose a tyrant, whom he defines to be him, that wilfully breaks all, or the principal conditions made between him and the commonwealth. Fen. Sac. Theolog. c. 13. and Cartwright in a prefixed epistle testifies his approbation of the whole book.

Gilby de obedientiâ. p. 25. and 105.

"Kings have their authority of the people, who may upon occasion reassume it to themselves.

England's complaint against the canons.

"The people may kill wicked princes as monsters and cruel beasts.

Christopher Goodman of obedience.

"When kings or rulers become blasphemers of God, oppressors and murderers of their subjects, they ought no more to be accounted kings or lawful magistrates, but as private men to be examined, accused, and condemned and punished by the law of God, and being convicted and punished by that law, it is not man's but God's doing." c. x. p. 139.

"By the civil laws, a fool or idiot born, and so proved, shall lose the lands and inheritance whereto he is born, because he is not able to use them aright: And especially ought in no case be suffered to have the government of a whole nation; but there is no such evil can come to the commonwealth by fools and idiots as doth by the rage and fury of ungodly rulers; such therefore being without God ought to have no authority over God's people, who by his word requireth the contrary." c. xi. p. 143, 144.

"No person is exempt by any law of God from this punishment: be he king, queen, or emperor, he must die the death, for God hath not placed them above others, to transgress his laws as they list, but to be subject to them as well as others; and if they be subject to his laws, then to the punishment also, so much the more as their example is more dangerous." c. xiii. p. 184.

"When magistrates cease to do their duty, the people are as it were without magistrates, yea worse, and then God giveth the sword into the people's hand, and he himself is become immediately their head." p. 185.

"If princes do right and keep promise with you, then do you owe to them all humble obedience; if not, ye are discharged, and your study ought to be in this case how ye may depose and punish according to the law such rebels against God and oppressors of their country." p. 190.

"This Goodman was a minister of the English Church at Geneva, as Dudley Fenner was at Middleburgh, or some other place in that country. These were the pastors of those saints and confessors who flying from the bloody persecution of queen Mary, gathered up at length their scattered members into many congregations; whereof some in upper, some in lower Germany, part of them settled at Geneva; where this author having preached on this subject to the great liking of certain learned and godly men who heard him,

him, was by them sundry times and with much instance required to write more fully on that point. Who thereupon took it in hand, and conferring with the best learned in those parts (among whom Calvin was then living in the same city) with their special approbation he published this treatise, aiming principally, as is testified by Whittingham in the preface, that his brethren of England, the protestants, might be persuaded in the truth of that doctrine concerning obedience to magistrates. Whittingham in preface.

“ These were the true protestant divines of England, our fathers in the faith we hold; this was their sense, who for so many years labouring under prelacy, through all storms and persecutions kept religion from extinguishing; and delivered it pure to us, till there arose a covetous and ambitious generation of divines (for divines they call themselves!) who feigning on a sudden to be new converts and proselytes from episcopacy, under which they had long temporised, opened their mouths at length, in shew against pluralities and prelacy, but with intent to swallow them down both; gorging themselves like Harpy’s on those simonious places and preferments of their outed predecessors, as the quarry for which they hunted, not to plurality only but to multiplicity; for possessing which they had accused them their brethren, and aspiring under another title to the same authority and usurpation over the consciences of all men.

“ Of this faction, diverse reverend and learned divines (as they are stiled in the phylactery of their own title-page) pleading the lawfulness of defensive arms against the king, in a treatise called “ Scripture and Reason,” seem in words to disclaim utterly the deposing of a king; but both the Scripture and the reasons which they use, draw consequences after them, which without their bidding, conclude it lawful. For if by Scripture, and by that especially to the Romans, which they most insist upon, kings, doing that which is contrary to Saint Paul’s definition of a magistrate, may be resisted, they may altogether with as much force of consequence be deposed or punished. And if by reason the unjust authority of kings “ may be forfeited in part, and his power be reassumed in part, either by the parliament or people, for the case in hazard and the present necessity,” as they affirm p. 34, there can no Scripture be alledged, no imaginable reason given, that necessity continuing, as it may always, and they in all prudence and their duty may take upon them to foresee it, why in such a case they may not finally amerce him with the loss of his kingdom, of whose amendment they have no hope. And if one wicked action persisted in against religion, laws, and liberties may warrant us to thus much in part, why may not forty times as many tyrannies by him committed, warrant us to proceed on restraining him, till the restraint become total. For the ways of justice are exactest proportion; if for one trespass of a king it require so much remedy or satisfaction, then for twenty more as hainous crimes, it requires of him twenty-fold; and so proportionably, till it come to what is utmost among men. If in these proceedings against their king they may not finish, by the usual course of justice, what they have begun, they could not lawfully begin at all. For this golden rule of justice and morality, as well as of arithmetic, out of three terms which they admit, will as certainly and unavoidably bring out the fourth, as any problem that ever Euclid or Apollonius made good by demonstration.

“ And if the parliament, being undeposable but by themselves, as is affirmed, p. 37, 38. might for his whole life, if they saw cause, take all power, authority, and the sword out of his hand, which in effect is to unmagistrate him, why might they not, being then themselves the sole magistrates in force, proceed to punish him who being lawfully deprived of all things that define a magistrate, can be now no magistrate to be degraded lower, but an offender to be punished. Lastly, whom they may defy, and meet in battle, why may they not as well prosecute by justice? For lawful war is but the execution of justice against them who refuse law. Among whom if it be lawful (as they deny not, p. 19, 20.) to slay the king himself coming in front at his own peril, wherefore may not justice do that intendedly, which the chance of a defensive war might without blame have done casually, nay purposely, if there it find him among the rest. They ask, p. 19.

“ By what rule of conscience or God, a state is bound to sacrifice religion, laws and liberties, rather than a prince defending such as subvert them, should come in hazard of his life.” And I ask by what conscience, or divinity, or law, or reason, a state is bound to leave all these sacred concerns under a perpetual hazard and extremity of danger, rather than cut off a wicked prince, who sits plotting day and night to subvert them : they tell us, that the law of nature justifies any man to defend himself, even against the king in person : let them shew us then why the same law, may not justify much more a state or whole people, to do justice upon him, against whom each private man may lawfully defend himself ; seeing all kind of justice done, is a defence to good men, as well as a punishment to bad ; and justice done upon a tyrant is no more but the necessary self-defence of a whole commonwealth. To war upon a king, that his instruments may be brought to condign punishment, and thereafter to punish them the instruments, and not to spare only, but to defend and honour him the author, is the strangest piece of justice to be called christian, and the strangest piece of reason to be called human, that by men of reverence and learning, as their stile imports them, ever yet was vented. They maintain in the third and fourth section, that a judge or inferior magistrate, is anointed of God, is his minister, hath the sword in his hand, is to be obeyed by St. Peter’s rule, as well as the supreme, and without difference any where exprest : and yet will have us fight against the supreme till he remove and punish the inferior magistrate (for such were greatest delinquents) whenas by Scripture, and by reason, there can no more authority be shewn to resist the one than the other ; and altogether as much, to punish or depose the supreme himself, as to make war upon him, till he punish or deliver up his inferior magistrates, whom in the same terms we are commanded to obey, and not to resist. Thus while they, in a cautious line or two here and there stuf in, are only verbal against the pulling down or punishing of tyrants, all the Scripture and the reason which they bring, is in every leaf direct and rational to infer it altogether as lawful, as to resist them. And yet in all their sermons, as hath by others been well noted, they went much further. For divines, if ye observe them, have their postures, and their motions no less expertly, and with no less variety than they that practise feats in the artillery-ground. Sometimes they seem furiously to march on, and presently march counter ; by and by they stand, and then retreat ; or if need be can face about, or wheel in a whole body, with that cunning and dexterity as is almost unperceivable ; to wind themselves by shifting ground into places of more advantage. And providence only must be the drum, providence the word of command, that calls them from above, but always to some larger benefice, or acts them into such or such figures, and promotions. At their turns and doublings no men readier, to the right, or to the left ; for it is their turns which they serve chiefly : herein only singular, that with them there is no certain hand right or left, but as their own commodity thinks best to call it. But if there come a truth to be defended, which to them, and their interest of this world seems not so profitable, strait these nimble motionists can find no even legs to stand upon ; and are no more of use to reformation thoroughly performed, and not superficially, or to the advancement of truth (which among mortal men is always in her progress) than if on a sudden they were struck maim, and crippled. Which the better to conceal, or the more to countenance by a general conformity to their own limping, they would have Scripture, they would have reason also made to halt with them for company ; and would put us off with impotent conclusions, lame and shorter than the premises. In this posture they seem to stand with great zeal and confidence on the wall of Sion ; but like Jebusites, not like Israelites, or Levites : blind also as well as lame, they discern not David from Adonibezec : but cry him up for the Lord’s anointed, whose thumbs and great toes not long before, they had cut off upon their pulpit cushions. Therefore he who is our only king, the root of David, and whose kingdom is eternal righteousness, with all those that war under him, whose happiness and final hopes are laid up in that only just and rightful kingdom (which we

we pray incessantly may come soon, and in so praying wish hasty ruin and destruction to all tyrants) even he our immortal king, and all that love him, must of necessity have in abomination these blind and lame defenders of Jerusalem; as the soul of David hated them, and forbid them entrance into God's house, and his own. But as to those before them, which I cited first (and with an easy search, for many more might be added) as they there stand, without more in number, being the best and chief of protestant divines, we may follow them for faithful guides, and without doubting may receive them, as witnesses abundant of what we here affirm concerning tyrants. And indeed I find it generally the clear and positive determination of them all, (not prelatical, or of this late faction sub-prelatical) who have written on this argument; that to do justice on a lawless king, is to a private man unlawful, to an inferior magistrate lawful: or if they were divided in opinion, yet greater than these here alledged, or of more authority in the Church, there can be none produced. If any one shall go about by bringing other testimonies to disable these, or by bringing these against themselves in other cited passages of their books, he will not only fail to make good that false and impudent assertion of those mutinous ministers, that the deposing and punishing of a king or tyrant, "is against the constant judgment of all protestant divines," it being quite the contrary; but will prove rather what perhaps he intended not, that the judgment of divines, if it be so various and inconstant to itself, is not considerable, or to be esteemed at all. Ere which be yielded, as I hope it never will, these ignorant assertors in their own art will have proved themselves more and more, not to be protestant divines, whose constant judgment in this point they have so audaciously belied, but rather to be a pack of hungry church-wolves, who in the steps of Simon Magus their father, following the hot scent of double livings and pluralities, advowsons, donatives, inductions, and augmentations, though uncalled to the flock of Christ, but by the mere suggestion of their bellies, like those priests of Bel, whose pranks Daniel found out; have got possession, or rather seized upon the pulpit, as the strong hold and fortrefs of their sedition and rebellion against the civil magistrate. Whose friendly and victorious hand having rescued them from the bishops their insulting lords, fed them plenteously, both in public and in private, raised them to be high and rich of poor and base; only suffered not their covetousness and fierce ambition (which as the pit that sent out their fellow locusts, hath been ever bottomless and boundless) to interpose in all things, and over all persons, their impetuous ignorance and importunity."

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

ARTICLES of PEACE

BETWEEN

JAMES Earl of ORMOND for King CHARLES the First on the one hand, and the IRISH Rebels and Papists on the other hand:

And on a Letter sent by ORMOND to Colonel JONES Governor of DUBLIN.

And a Representation of the SCOTS Presbytery at BELFAST in IRELAND.

To which the said Articles, Letter, with Colonel JONES's Answer to it, and Representation, &c. are prefixed.

A PROCLAMATION.

ORMOND,

WHEREAS articles of peace are made, concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between us, JAMES lord marquis of ORMOND, lord lieutenant general, and general governor of his majesty's kingdom of Ireland, by virtue of the authority wherewith we are intrusted, for, and on the behalf of his most excellent majesty of the one part, and the general assembly of the Roman Catholics of the said kingdom, for, and on the behalf of his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects of the same, on the other part; a true copy of which articles of peace are hereunto annexed: We the lord lieutenant do by this proclamation, in his majesty's name publish the same, and do in his majesty's name strictly charge and command all his majesty's subjects, and all others inhabiting or residing within his majesty's said kingdom of Ireland to take notice thereof, and to render due obedience to the same in all the parts thereof.

And as his majesty hath been induced to this peace, out of a deep sense of the miseries and calamities brought upon this his kingdom and people, and out of hope conceived by his majesty, that it may prevent the further effusion of his subjects blood, redeem them out of all the miseries and calamities under which they now suffer, restore them to
all

all quietness and happiness under his majesty's most gracious government, deliver the kingdom in general from those slaughters, depredations, rapines and spoils which always accompany a war, encourage the subjects and others with comfort to betake themselves to trade, traffic, commerce, manufacture and all other things, which uninterrupted, may increase the wealth and strength of the kingdom, beget in all his majesty's subjects of this kingdom a perfect unity amongst themselves, after the too long continued division amongst them: so his majesty assures himself that all his subjects of this his kingdom (duly considering the great and inestimable benefits which they may find in this peace) will with all duty render due obedience thereunto. And we, in his majesty's name, do hereby declare, That all persons so rendering due obedience to the said peace, shall be protected, cherished, countenanced and supported by his majesty, and his royal authority, according to the true intent and meaning of the said articles of peace.

*Given at our Castle
of Kilkenny, Ja-
nuary 17, 1648.*

GOD SAVE THE KING.

Articles of peace, made, concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between his excellency James lord marquis of Ormond, lord lieutenant general, and general of his majesty's kingdom of Ireland, for, and on the behalf of his most excellent majesty, by virtue of the authority wherewith the said lord lieutenant is intrusted, on the one part: and the general assembly of Roman Catholics of the said kingdom, for and on the behalf of his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects of the same, on the other part.

HIS Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, as thereunto bound by allegiance, duty and nature, do most humbly and freely acknowledge and recognize their sovereign lord king Charles to be lawful and undoubted king of this kingdom of Ireland, and other his highnesses realms and dominions: and his majesty's said Roman Catholic subjects, apprehending with a deep sense the sad condition whereunto his majesty is reduced, as a further testimony of their loyalty, do declare, that they and their posterity for ever, to the utmost of their power, even to the expence of their blood and fortunes, will maintain and uphold his majesty, his heirs and lawful successors, their rights, prerogatives, government and authority, and thereunto freely and heartily will render all due obedience.

Of which faithful and loyal recognition and declaration so seasonably made by the said Roman Catholics, his majesty is graciously pleased to accept, and accordingly to own them his loyal and dutiful subjects: and is further graciously pleased to extend unto them the following graces and securities.

I. IMPRIMIS, It is concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said lord lieutenant, for, and on the behalf of his most excellent majesty, and the said general assembly, for, and on the behalf of the said Roman Catholic subjects; and his majesty is graciously pleased, That it shall be enacted by Act to be passed in the next parliament to be held in this kingdom, that all and every the professors of the Roman Catholic religion within the said kingdom, shall be free and exempt from all mulcts, penalties, restraints and inhibitions, that are or may be imposed upon them by any law, statute, usage or custom whatsoever, for, or concerning, the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion: and that it shall be likewise enacted, That the said Roman Catholics, or any of them, shall not be questioned or molested in their persons, goods or estates, for any matter or cause whatsoever, for, concerning, or by reason of the free exercise of their religion,

religion, by virtue of any power, authority, statute, law or usage whatsoever : and that it shall be further enacted, That no Roman Catholic in this kingdom shall be compelled to exercise any religion, form of devotion, or divine service, other than such as shall be agreeable to their conscience ; and that they shall not be prejudiced or molested in their persons, goods, or estates for not observing, using or hearing the book of common-prayer, or any other form of devotion or divine service by virtue of any colour or statute made in the second year of queen Elizabeth, or by virtue or colour of any other law, declaration of law, statute, custom, or usage whatsoever, made or declared, or to be made or declared : and that it shall be further enacted, that the professors of the Roman Catholic religion, or any of them, be not bound or obliged to take the oath commonly called, the oath of Supremacy expressed in the statute of 2 Elizabeth, c. 1. or in any other statute or statutes : and that the said oath shall not be tendered unto them, and that the refusal of the said oath shall not redound to the prejudice of them, or any of them, they taking the oath of allegiance in hæc verba, viz. “ I A. B. do hereby acknowledge, profess, testify and declare in my conscience, before God and the world, that our sovereign lord king Charles is lawful and rightful king of this realm, and of other his majesty’s dominions and countries ; and I will bear faith and true allegiance to his majesty, and his heirs and successors, and him and them will defend to the uttermost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts whatsoever which shall be made against his or their crown and dignity ; and do my best endeavour to disclose and make known to his majesty, his heirs and successors, or to the lord deputy, or other his majesty’s chief governor or governors for the time being, all treason or traitorous conspiracies which I shall know or hear to be intended against his majesty, or any of them : and I do make this recognition and acknowledgment, heartily, willingly and truly, upon the true faith of a christian ; so help me God, &c.” Nevertheless, the said lord lieutenant doth not hereby intend that any thing in these concessions contained shall extend, or be construed to extend to the granting of churches, church-livings, or the exercise of jurisdiction, the authority of the said lord lieutenant not extending so far ; yet the said lord lieutenant is authorized to give the said Roman Catholics full assurance, as hereby the said lord lieutenant doth give unto the said Roman Catholics full assurance, that they or any of them shall not be molested in the possession which they have at present of the churches or church-livings, or of the exercise of their respective jurisdictions, as they now exercise the same, until such time as his majesty upon a full consideration of the desires of the said Roman Catholics in a free parliament to be held in this kingdom, shall declare his further pleasure.

II. Item, It is concluded, accorded and agreed upon by and between the said parties, and his majesty is further graciously pleased that a free parliament shall be held in this kingdom within six months after the date of these articles of Peace, or as soon after as Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnagh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis Lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnel esquire, Sir Lucas Dillon knight, Sir Nicholas Plunket knight, Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Brown, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and general Fennell, esquires, or the major part of them will desire the same, so that by possibility it may be held ; and that in the mean time, and until the articles of these presents, agreed to be passed in parliament, be accordingly passed, the same shall be inviolably observed as to the matters therein contained, as if they were enacted in parliament : and that in case a parliament be not called and held in this kingdom within two years next after the date of these articles of peace, then his majesty’s lord lieutenant, or other his majesty’s chief governor or governors of this kingdom for the time being, will at the request of the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnel esquire, Sir Lucas Dillon knight, Sir Nicholas Plunket knight, Sir Richard Barnwall

Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Brown, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell Esquires, or the major part of them, call a general assembly of the lords and commons of this kingdom, to attend upon the said lord lieutenant or other his majesty's chief governor or governors of this kingdom for the time being, in such convenient place, for the better settling of the affairs of the kingdom. And it is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon by and between the said parties, that all matters that by these articles are agreed upon to be passed in parliament, shall be transmitted into England, according to the usual form, to be passed in the said parliament, and that the said acts so agreed upon, and so to be passed, shall receive no disjunction or alteration here in England; provided that nothing shall be concluded by both or either of the said houses of parliament, which may bring prejudice to any of his majesty's Protestant party, or their adherents, or to his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects or their adherents, other than such things as upon this treaty are concluded to be done, or such things as may be proper for the committee of privileges of either or both houses to take cognizance of, as in such cases heretofore hath been accustomed; and other than such matters as his majesty will be graciously pleased to declare his further pleasure in, to be passed in parliament for the satisfaction of his subjects; and other than such things as shall be propounded to either or both houses by his majesty's lord lieutenant or other chief governor or governors of this kingdom for the time being, during the said parliament, for the advancement of his majesty's service, and the peace of the kingdom; which clause is to admit no construction which may trench upon the articles of peace or any of them; and that both houses of parliament may consider what they shall think convenient touching the repeal or suspension of the statute commonly called, Poyning's Act, entitled, An Act that no parliament be holden in that land, until the Acts be certified into England.

III. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is graciously pleased, That all acts, ordinances and orders made by both or either houses of parliament, to the blemish, dishonour, or prejudice of his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects of this kingdom, or any of them since the 7th of August 1641, shall be vacated; and that the same and all exemplifications and other acts which continue the memory of them be made void by act to be passed in the next parliament to be held in this kingdom: and that in the mean time the said acts or ordinances, or any of them, shall be no prejudice to the said Roman Catholics, or any of them.

IV. Item, It is also concluded, and agreed upon, and his majesty is likewise graciously pleased, That all indictments, attainders, outlawries in this kingdom, and all the processes and other proceedings thereupon, and all letters patents, grants, leases, customs, bonds, recognizances, and all records, act or acts, office or offices, inquisitions, and all other things depending upon, or taken by reason of the said indictments, attainders or outlawries, since the 7th day of August, 1641, in prejudice of the said Catholics, their heirs, executors, administrators or assigns, or any of them, or the widows of them, or any of them, shall be vacated and made void in such sort as no memory shall remain thereof, to the blemish, dishonour or prejudice of the said Catholics, their heirs, executors, administrators or assigns, or any of them; or the widows of them, or any of them; and that to be done when the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnel esquire, Sir Lucas Dillon knight, Sir Nicholas Plunket knight, Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Brown, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neal, Miles Reilie and Gerrald Fennell, esquires, or the major part of them shall desire the same, so that by possibility it may be done: and in the mean time that no such indictments, attainders, outlawries, processes, or any other proceedings thereupon, or any letters patents, grants, leases, custodiams, bonds, recognizances, or any record or acts, office or offices, inquisitions, or any other thing depending upon, or by reason of the said indictments, attainders or outlawries, shall

shall in any sort prejudice the said Roman Catholics, or any of them, but that they and every of them shall be forthwith, upon perfection of these articles, restored to their respective possessions and hereditaments respectively; provided, that no man shall be questioned by reason hereof, for meane rates or wastes, saving wilful wastes committed after the first day of May last past.

V. Item, It is likewise concluded, accorded and agreed, and his majesty is graciously pleased, That as soon as possible may be, all impediments which may hinder the said Roman Catholics to sit or vote in the next intended parliament, or to choose, or to be chosen knights and burgeses, to sit or vote there, shall be removed, and that before the said parliament.

VI. Item, It is concluded, accorded and agreed upon, and his majesty is further graciously pleased, That all debts shall remain as they were upon the twenty-third of October, 1641. Notwithstanding any disposition made or to be made, by virtue or colour of any attainder, outlawry, fugacy, or other forfeiture; and that no disposition or grant made, or to be made of any such debts, by virtue of any attainder, outlawry, fugacy, or other forfeiture, shall be of force; and this to be passed as an act in the next parliament,

VII. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, and his majesty is graciously pleased, That for the securing of the estates or reputed estates of the lords, knights, gentlemen and freeholders, or reputed freeholders, as well of Connaght and county of Clare, or country of Thomond, as of the counties of Limerick and Tipperary, the same to be secured by act of parliament, according to the intent of the twenty-fifth article of the graces granted in the fourth year of his majesty's reign, the tenor whereof for so much as concerneth the same, doth ensue in these words, viz. We are graciously pleased, that for the inhabitants of Connaght and country of Thomond and county of Clare, that their several estates shall be confirmed unto them and their heirs against us, and our heirs and successors, by act to be passed in the next parliament to be holden in Ireland, to the end the same may never hereafter be brought into any further question by us, or our heirs and successors. In which act of parliament so to be passed, you are to take care that all tenures in Capite, and all rents and services as are now due, or which ought to be answered unto us out of the said lands and premises, by any letters patent past thereof since the first year of king Henry VIII. or found by any office taken from the said first year of king Henry VIII. until the twenty-first of July 1645, whereby our late dear father, or any his predecessors actually received any profit by wardship, liveries, primer-seisins, meane rates, ousterlemains or fines of alienation without licence, be again reserved unto us, our heirs and successors, and all the rest of the premises to be holden of our castle of Athlone by knights service, according to our said late father's letters, notwithstanding any tenures in Capite found for us by office, since the twenty-first of July 1615, and not appearing in any such letters patent, or offices; within which rule his majesty is likewise graciously pleased, That the said lands in the counties of Limerick and Tipperary be included, but to be held by such rents and tenures only, as they were in the fourth year of his majesty's reign; provided always, that the said lords, knights, gentlemen and freeholders of the said province of Connaght, county of Clare, and country of Thomond, and counties of Tipperary and Limerick, shall have and enjoy the full benefit of such composition and agreement which shall be made with his most excellent majesty, for the court of wards, tenures, respites and issues of homage, any clause in this article to the contrary notwithstanding. And as for the lands within the counties of Kilkenny and Wickloe, unto which his majesty was intitled by offices, taken or found in the time of the earl of Strafford's government in this kingdom, his majesty is further graciously pleased, That the state thereof shall be considered in the next intended parliament, where his majesty will assent unto that which shall be just and honourable; and that the like act of limitation of his majesty's titles, for the security of the estates of his subjects of this kingdom be passed in the said parliament as was enacted in the twenty-first year of his late majesty king James his reign in England.

VIII. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, and his majesty is further graciously pleased, that all incapacities imposed upon the natives of this kingdom or any of them, as natives, by any act of parliament, provisos in patents or otherwise, be taken away by act to be passed in the said parliament; and that they may be enabled to erect one or more inns of court in or near the city of Dublin or elsewhere, as shall be thought fit by his majesty's lord lieutenant, or other chief governor or governors of this kingdom for the time being; and in case the said inns of court shall be erected before the first day of the next parliament, then the same shall be in such places as his majesty's lord lieutenants or other chief governor or governors of this kingdom for the time being, by and with the advice and consent of the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costolough lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnell esquire, Sir Lucas Dillon knight, Sir Nicholas Plunket knight, Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrilah O Neile, Miles Reily, Gerral Fennell esquires, or any seven or more of them shall think fit; and that such students, natives of this kingdom, as shall be therein, may take and receive the usual degrees accustomed in any inns of court, they taking the ensuing oath; viz. "I A. B. do hereby acknowledge, profess, testify and declare in my conscience before God and the world, that our sovereign lord king Charles is lawful and rightful king of this realm, and of other his majesty's dominions and countries; and I will bear faith and true allegiance to his majesty, and his heirs and successors, and him and them will defend to the utmost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts whatsoever, which shall be made against his or their crown and dignity; and do my best endeavour to disclose and make known to his majesty, his heirs and successors, or to the lord deputy, or other his majesty's chief governor or governors for the time being, all treason or traitorous conspiracies which I shall know or hear to be intended against his majesty or any of them. And I do here make this recognition and acknowledgment heartily, willingly and truly, upon the true faith of a christian; so help me God, &c. And his majesty is further graciously pleased, that his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects may erect and keep free schools for education of youths in this kingdom, any law or statute to the contrary notwithstanding; and that all the matters assented unto in this article be passed as acts of parliament in the said next parliament.

IX. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is graciously pleased, that places of command, honour, profit and trust in his majesty's armies in this kingdom, shall be upon perfection of these articles actually and by particular instances conferred upon his Roman Catholic subjects of this kingdom; and that upon the distribution, conferring and disposing of the places of command, honour, profit and trust in his majesty's armies in this kingdom, for the future no difference shall be made between the said Roman Catholics, and other his majesty's subjects; but that such distribution shall be made with equal indifferency according to their respective merits and abilities; and that all his majesty's subjects of this kingdom, as well Roman Catholics as others, may for his majesty's service and their own security, arm themselves the best they may, wherein they shall have all fitting encouragement. And it is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is further graciously pleased, That places of command, honour, profit and trust in the civil government in this kingdom, shall be upon passing of the bills in these articles mentioned in the next parliament, actually and by particular instances conferred upon his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects of this kingdom; and that in the distribution, conferring and disposal of the places of command, honour, profit and trust in the civil government, for the future no difference shall be made between the said Roman Catholics, and other his majesty's subjects, but that such distribution shall be made with equal indifferency, according to their respective merits and abilities; and that in the distribution of ministerial offices or places,

which now are, or hereafter shall be void in this kingdom, equality shall be used to the Roman Catholic natives of this kingdom, as to other his majesty's subjects; and that the command of forts, castles, garison-towns, and other places of importance of this kingdom, shall be conferred upon his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects of this kingdom, upon perfection of these articles actually and by particular instances; and that in the distribution, conferring and disposal of the forts, castles, garison-towns, and other places of importance in this kingdom, no difference shall be made between his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects of this kingdom, and other his majesty's subjects, but that such distribution shall be made with equal indifferency, according to their respective merits and abilities; and that until full settlement in parliament fifteen thousand foot, and two thousand and five hundred horse of the Roman Catholics of this kingdom shall be of the standing army of this kingdom: and that until full settlement in parliament as aforesaid, the said lord lieutenant or other chief governor or governors of this kingdom for the time being, and the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnell esq; Sir Lucas Dillon knight, Sir Nicholas Plunket knight, Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Brown, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell esq; or any seven or more of them, the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnell esq; Sir Lucas Dillon kt. Sir Nicholas Plunket kt. Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily, and Gerrald Fennell esquires, shall diminish or add unto the said number, as they shall see cause from time to time.

X. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is further graciously pleased, that his majesty will accept of the yearly rent, or annual sum of twelve thousand pounds sterling, to be applotted with indifferency and equality, and consented to be paid to his majesty, his heirs and successors in parliament, for and in lieu of the court of wards in this kingdom, tenures in Capite, common-knights service, and all other tenures within the cognizance of that court, and for, and in lieu of all wardships, primer-seizins, fines, ousterlemains, liveries, intrusions, alienations, measne rates, releases and all other profits, within the cognizance of the said court, or incident to the said tenures, or any of them, or fines to accrue to his majesty by reason of the said tenures or any of them, and for and in-lieu of respits and issues of homage and fines for the same. And the said yearly rent being so applotted and consented unto in parliament as aforesaid, then a bill is to be agreed on in the said parliament to be passed as an act for the securing of the said yearly rent, or annual sum of twelve thousand pounds to be applotted as aforesaid, and for the extinction and taking away of the said court, and other matters aforesaid in this article contained. And it is further agreed, that reasonable compositions shall be accepted for wardships since the twenty-third of October 1641, and already granted; and that no wardships fallen and not granted, or that shall fall, shall be passed until the success of this article shall appear; and if his majesty be secured as aforesaid, then all wardships fallen since the said twenty-third of October, are to be included in the argument aforesaid, upon composition to be made with such as have grants as aforesaid; which composition to be made with the grantees since the time aforesaid, is to be left to indifferent persons, and the umpirage to the said lord lieutenant.

XI. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is further graciously pleased, That no nobleman or peer of this realm, in parliament, shall be hereafter capable of more proxies than two, and that blank proxies shall be hereafter totally disallowed; and that if such noblemen or peers of this realm, as have no estates in this kingdom, do not within five years, to begin from the
conclusion

conclusion of these articles, purchase in this kingdom as followeth, viz. a lord baron 200 l. per annum, a lord viscount 400 l. per annum, and an earl 600 l. per annum, a marquis 800 l. per annum, a duke 1000 l. per annum, shall lose their votes in parliament until such time as they shall afterwards acquire such estates respectively; and that none be admitted in the house of commons, but such as shall be estated and resident within this kingdom.

XII. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is further graciously pleased, That as for and concerning the independency of the parliament of Ireland on the parliament of England, his majesty will leave both houses of parliament in this kingdom to make such declaration therein as shall be agreeable to the laws of the kingdom of Ireland.

XIII. Item, It is further concluded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is further graciously pleased, that the council-table shall contain itself within its proper bounds, in handling matters of state and weight fit for that place; amongst which the patents of plantation, and the offices whereupon those grants are founded, to be handled, as matters of state, and to be heard and determined by his majesty's lord lieutenant, or other chief governor or governors for the time being, and the council publicly at the council-board, and not otherwise; but titles between party and party grown after these patents granted, are to be left to the ordinary course of law; and that the council-table do not hereafter intermeddle with common business, that is within the cognizance of the ordinary courts, nor with the altering of possessions of lands, nor make, nor use, private orders, hearings or references concerning any such matter, nor grant any injunction or order for stay of any suits in any civil cause: and that parties grieved for or by reason of any proceedings formerly had there, may commence their suits, and prosecute the same in any of his majesty's courts of justice or equity for remedy of their pretended rights, without any restraint or interruption from his majesty, or otherwise, by the chief governor or governors and council of this kingdom: and that the proceedings in the respective precedence courts shall be pursuant, and according to his majesty's printed book of instructions, and that they shall contain themselves within the limits prescribed by that book, when the kingdom shall be restored to such a degree of quietness, as they be not necessarily enforced to exceed the same.

XIV. Item, It is further concluded, accorded, and agreed upon by and between the said parties, and his majesty is further graciously pleased, That as for and concerning one statute made in this kingdom, in the eleventh year of the reign of queen Elizabeth, intituled, An Act for staying of wool-flocks, tallow and other necessities within this realm: and another statute made in the said kingdom in the twelfth year of the reign of the said queen, intituled, An Act

And one other statute made in the said kingdom, in the 13th year of the reign of the said late queen, intituled, An exemplation of the act made in a session of this parliament for the staying of wool-flocks, tallow, and other wares and commodities mentioned in the said act, and certain articles added to the same act, all concerning staple or native commodities of this kingdom, shall be repealed, if it shall be so thought fit in the parliament (excepting for wool and wool-fells) and that such indifferent persons as shall be agreed on by the said lord lieutenant, and the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord-president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskery, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-donnell esquires, Sir Lucas Dillon knt. Sir Nicholas Plunket knt. Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Brown, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerald Fennell esquires, or any seven or more of them shall be authorized by commission under the great seal, to moderate and ascertain the rates of merchandize to be exported or imported out of, or into this kingdom, as they shall think fit.

XV. Item, It is concluded, accorded and agreed, by and between the said parties and his majesty is graciously pleased, that all and every person and persons within this kingdom, pretending to have suffered by offices found of several countries, territories, lands and hereditaments in the province of Ulster, and other provinces of this kingdom, in or since the first year of king James his reign, or by attainders or forfeitures, or by pretence and colour thereof, since the said first year of king James, or by other acts depending on the said offices, attainders and forfeitures, may petition his majesty in parliament for relief and redress; and if after examination it shall appear to his majesty, the said persons, or any of them have been injured, then his majesty will prescribe a course to repair the person or persons so suffering, according to justice and honour.

XVI. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is graciously pleased, That as to the particular cases of Maurice lord viscount de Rupe and Fermoy, Arthur lord viscount Iveagh, Sir Edward Fitz-Gerrald of Cloanglish baronet, Charles Mac-Carty Reag, Roger Moore, Anthony Mare, William Fitz-Gerrald, Anthony Linch, John Lacy, Collo Mac-brien Mac-Mahowne, Daniel Castigni, Edmond Fitz-Gerrald of Ballimartir, Lucas Keating, Theobald Roch Fitz-Miles, Thomas Fitz-Gerrald of the Vally, John Bourke of Loughmaske, Edmond Fitz-Gerrald of Ballimallo, James Fitz-William Gerrald of Glinane, and Edward Sutton, they may petition his majesty in the next parliament, whereupon his majesty will take such consideration of them as shall be just and fit.

XVII. Item, It is likewise concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is graciously pleased, That the citizens, freemen, burgessees and former inhabitants of the city of Cork, towns of Youghall and Downegarven, shall be forthwith, upon perfection of these articles, restored to their respective possessions and estates in the said city and towns respectively, where the same extends not to the endangering of the said garrisons in the said city and towns. In which case, so many of the said citizens and inhabitants, as shall not be admitted to the present possession of their houses within the said city and towns, shall be afforded a valuable annual rent for the same, until settlement in parliament, at which time they shall be restored to those their possessions. And it is further agreed, and his majesty is graciously pleased, that the said citizens, freemen, burgessees and inhabitants of the said city of Cork, and towns of Youghall and Downegarven, respectively, shall be enabled in convenient time before the next parliament to be held in this kingdom, to chuse and return burgessees into the same parliament.

XVIII. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is further graciously pleased, That an act of oblivion be past in the next parliament, to extend to all his majesty's subjects of this kingdom, and their adherents, of all treasons and offences, capital, criminal and personal, and other offences of what nature, kind or quality soever, in such manner, as if such treasons or offences had never been committed, perpetrated or done: That the said act do extend to the heirs, children, kindred, executors, administrators, wives, widows, dowagers, or assigns of such of the said subjects and their adherents who died on, before, or since, the 23d of October, 1641. That the said act do relate to the first day of the next parliament; that the said act do extend to all bodies politic and corporate, and their respective successors, and unto all cities, burroughs, counties, baronies, hundreds, towns, villages, thitlings, and every of them within this kingdom, for and concerning all and every of the said offences, or any other offence or offences in them, or any of them committed or done by his majesty's said subjects, or their adherents, or any of them, before, in or since the 23d of October, 1641. Provided this act shall not extend to be construed to pardon any offence or offences, for which any person or persons have been convicted or attainted on record at any time before the 23d day of October, in the year of our Lord 1641. That this act shall extend to Piracies, and all other offences committed
upon

upon the sea by his majesty's said subjects, or their adherents, or any of them; that in this act of oblivion, words of release, acquittal and discharge be inserted, that no person or persons, bodies politic or corporate, counties, cities, burroughs, baronies, hundreds, towns, villages, thitlings, or any of them within this kingdom, included within the said act, be troubled, impeached, sued, inquieted or molested, for, or by reason of any offence, matter or thing whatsoever, comprised within the said act: and the said act shall extend to all rents, goods and chattels taken, detained or grown due to the subjects of the one party from the other since the 23d of October, 1641. to the date of these articles of peace; and also to all customs, rents, arrears of rents, to prizes, recognizances, bonds, fines, forfeitures, penalties, and to all other profits, perquisites and dues which were due, or did, or should accrue to his majesty on, before, or since the 23d of October, 1641. until the perfection of these articles, and likewise to all measne rates, fines of what nature soever, recognizances, judgments, executions thereupon, and penalties whatsoever, and to all other profits due to his majesty since the said 23d of October and before, until the perfection of these articles, for, by reason, or which lay within the survey or recognizance of the court of wards; and also to all respits, issues of homage and fines for the same: Provided this shall not extend to discharge or remit any of the king's debts or subsidies due before the said 23d of October, 1641. which were then or before levied, or taken by the sheriffs, commissioners, receivers or collectors, and not then or before accounted for, or since disposed to the public use of the said Roman Catholic subjects, but that such persons may be brought to account for the same after full settlement in parliament, and not before, unless by and with the advice and consent of the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaught, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac Donnel, esquire, Sir Lucas Dillon knt. Sir Nicholas Plunket knt. Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell esquires, or any seven or more of them, as the said lord lieutenant otherwise shall think fit; provided, that such barbarous and inhuman crimes as shall be particularized and agreed upon by the said lord lieutenant, and the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnel esquire, Sir Lucas Dillon, knt. Sir Nicholas Plunket knt. Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell esquires, or any seven or more of them, as to the actors and procurers thereof, be left to be tried and adjudged by such indifferent commissioners as shall be agreed upon by the said lord lieutenant; and the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnel esquire, Sir Lucas Dillon knt. Sir Nicholas Plunket knt. Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell, esquires, or any seven or more of them; and that the power of the said commissioners shall continue only for two years next ensuing the date of their commission, which commission is to issue within six months after the date of these articles; provided also that the commissioners to be agreed on for the trial of the said particular crimes to be excepted, shall hear, order and determine all cases of trust, where relief may or ought in equity to be afforded against all manner of persons, according to the equity and circumstances of every such cases; and his majesty's chief governor or governors, and other magistrates for the time being, in all his majesty's courts of justice, and other his majesty's officers of what condition or quality soever, be bound and required to take notice of, and pursue the said act of oblivion without pleading or suit to be made for the same; and that no clerk or other officers do make out or write out any manner of writs, processes, summons or other precept, for, concerning, or by reason of any matter, cause or thing whatsoever released, forgiven, discharged, or to be forgiven by the said act, under
pain

pain of twenty pound sterling, and that no sheriff or other officer, do execute any such writ, process, summons or precept; and that no record, writing or memory, do remain of any offence or offences, released or forgiven, or mentioned to be forgiven by this act; and that all other clauses usually inserted in acts of general pardon or oblivion, enlarging his majesty's grace and mercy, not herein particularized, be inserted and comprized in the said act, when the bill shall be drawn up with the exceptions already expressed, and none other. Provided always, that the said act of oblivion shall not extend to any treason, felony or other offence or offences, which shall be committed or done from or after the date of these articles, until the first day of the before-mentioned next parliament, to be held in this kingdom. Provided also, that any act or acts which shall be done by virtue, pretence or in pursuance of these articles of peace agreed upon, or any act or acts which shall be done by virtue, colour or pretence of the power or authority used or exercised by and amongst the confederate Roman Catholics after the date of the said articles, and before the said publication, shall not be accounted, taken, construed, or to be, treason, felony or other offence to be excepted out of the said act of oblivion; provided likewise, that the said act of oblivion shall not extend unto any person or persons, that will not obey and submit unto the peace concluded and agreed on by these articles; provided further, that the said act of oblivion, or any thing in this article contained, shall not hinder or interrupt the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnel esq; Sir Lucas Dillon kt. Sir Nicholas Plunket kt. Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell, esquires, or any seven or more of them, to call to an account, and proceed against the council and congregation, and the respective supreme councils, commissioners general, appointed hitherto from time to time by the confederate Catholics to manage their affairs, or any other person or persons accountable to an accompt for their respective receipts and disbursements, since the beginning of their respective employments under the said confederate Catholics, or to acquit or release any arrears of excises, customs, or public taxes to be accounted for since the 23d of October 1641; and not disposed of hitherto, to the public use, but that the parties therein concerned may be called to an account for the same as aforesaid, by the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnel esquire, Sir Lucas Dillon kt. Sir Nicholas Plunket kt. Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell, esquires, or any seven or more of them, the said act or any thing therein contained to the contrary notwithstanding.

XIX. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is graciously pleased, that an act be passed in the next parliament, prohibiting, that neither the lord deputy, or other chief governor or governors, lord chancellor, lord high treasurer, vice-treasurer, chancellor, or any of the barons of the exchequer, privy council, or judges of the four courts, be farmers of his majesty's customs within this kingdom.

XX. Item, It is likewise concluded, accorded and agreed, and his majesty is graciously pleased, that an act of parliament pass in this kingdom against monopolies, such as was enacted in England 21 Jacobi Regis, with a further clause of repealing of all grants of monopolies in this kingdom; and that commissioners be agreed upon by the said lord lieutenant, and the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh, lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnel, esq; Sir Lucas Dillon kt. Sir Nicholas Plunket kt. Sir Richard Barnwall bar. Jeffery Browne, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell esquires, or any seven or more of them, to set down the rates for the custom and imposition to be laid on Aquavitæ, Wine, Oil, Yarn and Tobacco.

XXI. Item,

XXI. Item, It is concluded, accorded and agreed, and his majesty is graciously pleased, that such persons as shall be agreed on by the said lord lieutenant, and the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnel esquire, Sir Lucas Dillon knight, Sir Nicholas Plunket knight Sir Richard Barnwall Baronet, Jeffery Brown, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell esquires, or any seven or more of them, shall be as soon as may be authorized by commission under the great seal to regulate the court of castle-chamber, and such causes as shall be brought into, and censured in the said court.

XXII. Item, It is concluded, accorded and agreed upon, and his majesty is graciously pleased, that two acts lately passed in this kingdom, one prohibiting the plowing with horses by the tail, and the other prohibiting the burning of oats in the straw, be repealed.

XXIII. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is further graciously pleased, for as much as upon application of agents from this kingdom unto his majesty in the fourth year of his reign, and lately upon humble suit made unto his majesty, by a committee of both houses of the parliament of this kingdom, order was given by his majesty for redress of several grievances, and for so many of those as are not expressed in the articles, whereof both houses in the next ensuing parliament shall desire the benefit of his majesty's said former directions for redress therein, that the same be afforded them; yet so, as for prevention of inconveniencies to his majesty's service, that the warning mentioned in the 24th article of the graces in the fourth year of his majesty's reign be so understood, that the warning being left at the person's dwelling-houses be held sufficient warning; and as to the 22d article of the said graces, the process hitherto used in the court of wards do still continue, as hitherto it hath done in that, and hath been used in other English courts; but the court of wards being compounded for, so much of the aforesaid answer as concerns warning and process shall be omitted.

XXIV. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is further graciously pleased, that maritime causes may be determined in this kingdom, without driving of merchants or others to appeal and seek justice elsewhere: and if it shall fall out that there be cause of an appeal, the party grieved is to appeal to his majesty in the chancery of Ireland; and that sentence thereupon to be given by the delegates, to be definitive, and not be questioned upon any further appeal, except it be in the parliament of this kingdom, if the parliament shall then be sitting, otherwise not, this to be by act of parliament; and until the said parliament, the admiralty and maritime causes shall be ordered and settled by the said lord lieutenant, or other chief governor or governors of this kingdom for the time being, by and with the advice and consent of the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnel esq; Sir Lucas Dillon knight, Sir Nicholas Plunket knight, Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnagh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell, esquires, or any seven or more of them.

XXV. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is graciously pleased, that his majesty's subjects of this kingdom be eased of all rents and increase of rents lately raised on the commission or defective titles in the earl of Strafford's government, this to be by act of parliament; and that in the mean time the said rents or increase of rents shall not be written for by any process, or the payment thereof in any sort procured.

XXVI. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is further graciously pleased, that by act to be passed in the next parliament, all the arrears of interest-money, which did accrue and grow due by way of debt, mortgage or otherwise, and yet not so satisfied since the 23d of October 1641, until
the

the perfection of these articles, shall be fully forgiven and be released; and that for and during the space of three years next ensuing, no more shall be taken for use or interest of money than five pounds per Centum. And in cases of equity arising through disability, occasioned by the distempers of the times, the considerations of equity to be like unto both parties; but as for mortgages contracted between his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects and others of that party, where entry hath been made by the mortgagers against law, and the condition of their mortgages, and detained wrongfully by them without giving any satisfaction to the mortgagees, or where any such mortgagers have made profit of the lands mortgaged above country charges, yet answer no rent, or other consideration to the mortgagees, the parties grieved respectively to be left for relief to a course of equity therein.

XXVII. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, and his majesty is further graciously pleased, that immediately upon perfection of these articles, the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-donnell esq; Sir Lucas Dillon knight, Sir Nicholas Plunket knight, Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell esquires, shall be authorized by the said lord lieutenant to proceed in, hear, determine and execute, in and throughout this kingdom, the ensuing particulars, and all the matters thereupon depending; and that such authority and other the authorities hereafter mentioned shall remain of force without revocation, alteration or diminution, until acts of parliament be passed, according to the purport and intent of these articles; and that in case of death, miscarriage, disability to serve by reason of sickness or otherwise of any the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-donnell esq; Sir Lucas Dillon knight, Sir Nicholas Plunket knight, Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell esquires, and his majesty's lord lieutenant, or other chief governor or governors of this kingdom for the time being, shall name and authorize another in the place of such as shall be so dead or shall miscarry himself, or be so disabled, and that the same shall be such person as shall be allowed of by the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh, lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-donnell esq; Sir Lucas Dillon kt. Sir Nicholas Plunket kt. Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnagh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell esquires, or any seven or more of them, shall have power to applot, raise and levy means with indifferency and equality by way of excise or otherwise, upon all his majesty's subjects within the said kingdom, their persons, estates and goods, towards the maintenance of such army or armies as shall be thought fit to continue, and be in pay for his majesty's service, the defence of the kingdom, and other the necessary public charges thereof, and towards the maintenance of the forts, castles, garrisons and towns, until there shall be a settlement in parliament of both or either party, other than such of the said forts, garrisons and castles, as from time to time shall be thought fit, by his majesty's chief governor or governors of this kingdom for the time being, by and with the advice and consent of the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-donnell esq; Sir Lucas Dillon kt. Sir Nicholas Plunket kt. Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and

Gerrald Fennell esquires, or any seven or more of them, not to be maintained at the charge of the public; provided that his majesty's lord lieutenant or other chief governor or governors of this kingdom for the time being, be first made acquainted with such taxes, levies and excises as shall be made, and the manner of levying thereof, and that he approve the same; and to the end that such of the protestant party as shall submit to the peace, may in the several countries where any of their estates lie, have equality and indifferency in the assessments and levies that shall concern their estates in the said several counties.

It is concluded, accorded and agreed upon, and his majesty is graciously pleased, that in the directions which shall issue to any such county, for the applotting, subdividing and levying of the said public assessments, some of the said protestant party shall be joined with others of the Roman Catholic party to that purpose, and for effecting that service; and the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnel esq; Sir Lucas Dillon kt. Sir Nicholas Plunket kt. Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell esqs; or any seven or more of them, shall have power to levy the arrears of all excises and other public taxes imposed by the confederate Roman Catholics, and yet unpaid, and to call receivers and other accomptants of all former taxes and all public dues to a just and strict account, either by themselves, or by such as they or any seven or more of them shall name or appoint; and that the said lord lieutenant, or any other chief governor or governors of this kingdom for the time being, shall from time to time issue commissions to such person or persons as shall be named and appointed by the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnel esq; Sir Lucas Dillon kt. Sir Nicholas Plunket kt. Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell esquires, or any seven or more of them, for letting, setting, and improving the estates of all such person and persons, as shall adhere to any party opposing his majesty's authority, and not submitting to the peace; and that the profits of such estates shall be converted by the said lord lieutenant, or other chief governor or governors of this kingdom for the time being, to the maintenance of the king's army and other necessary charges, until settlement by parliament; and that the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnel esq; Sir Lucas Dillon kt. Sir Nicholas Plunket kt. Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell esquires, or any seven or more of them, shall have power to applot, raise and levy means with indifferency and equality, for the buying of arms and ammunition, and for the entertaining of frigates in such proportion as shall be thought fit by his majesty's lord lieutenant or other chief governors of this kingdom for the time being, by and with the advice and consent of the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnel esq; Sir Lucas Dillon kt. Sir Nicholas Plunket kt. Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell esquires, or any seven or more of them; the said arms and ammunition to be laid up in such magazines, and under the charge of such persons as shall be agreed on by the said lord lieutenant, and the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord Viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, Alexander Mac-Donnel esq; Sir Lucas Dillon kt. Sir Nicholas Plunket kt. Sir Richard Barnwall baronet, Jeffery Browne, Donnogh O Callaghan, Tyrlah O Neile, Miles Reily and Gerrald Fennell esquires, or any seven or more of them, and to be disposed of, and the said frigates to be employed for his majesty's service, and the public use and benefit of this

kingdom of Ireland; and that the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, &c. or any seven or more of them, shall have power to applot, raise and levy means with indifferency and equality, by way of excise or otherwise, in the several cities, corporate towns, counties and part of counties, now within the quarters and only upon the estates of the said confederate Roman Catholics, all such sum and sums of money as shall appear to the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, &c. or any seven or more of them, to be really due, for and in the discharge of the public engagements of the said confederate Catholics, incurred and grown due before the conclusion of these articles; and that the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, &c. or any seven or more of them, shall be authorized to appoint receivers, collectors and all other officers, for such monies as shall be assessed, taxed or applotted, in pursuance of the authorities mentioned in this article, and for the arrears of all former applotments, taxes and other public dues yet unpaid: And that the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, &c. or any seven or more of them, in case of refractories or delinquency, may distrain and imprison, and cause such delinquents to be distrained and imprisoned. And the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, &c. or any seven or more of them make perfect books of all such monies as shall be applotted, raised or levied, out of which books they are to make several and respective abstracts, to be delivered under their hands, or the hands of any seven or more of them, to the several and respective collectors, which shall be appointed to levy and receive the same. And that a duplicate of the said books, under the hands of the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, &c. or any seven or more of them, be delivered unto his majesty's lord lieutenant, or other chief governor or governors of this kingdom for the time being, whereby a perfect account may be given; and that the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, &c. or any seven or more of them, shall have power to call the council and congregation, and the respective supreme councils, and commissioners general, appointed hitherto from time to time, by the said confederate Roman Catholics, to manage their public affairs, and all other persons accountable, to an account, for all their receipts and disbursements since the beginning of their respective employments, under the confederate Roman Catholics.

XXVIII. Item, It is concluded, accorded and agreed, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is graciously pleased, that for the preservation of the peace and tranquility of the kingdom, the said lord-lieutenant, and the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, &c. or any seven or more of them, shall for the present agree upon such persons, who are to be authorized by commission under the great seal, to be commissioners of the Peace, Oyer and Terminer, Assizes and Goal-delivery, in, and throughout the kingdom, to continue during pleasure, with such power as justices of the Peace, Oyer and Terminer, Assizes and Goal-delivery in former time of Peace have usually had, which is not to extend unto any crime or offence committed before the first of May last past, and to be qualified with power to hear and determine all civil causes coming before them, not exceeding ten pounds; provided that they shall not intermeddle with titles of lands; provided likewise, the authority of such commissioners shall not extend to question any person or persons, for any shipping, cattle or goods, heretofore taken by either party from the other, or other injuries done contrary to the articles of cessation, concluded by and with the said Roman Catholic party in, or since May last, but that the same shall be deter-

determined by such indifferent persons, as the lord lieutenant, by the advice and consent of the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, &c. or any seven or more of them shall think fit, to the end that speedy and equal justice may be done to all parties grieved; and the said commissioners are to make their estreats as accustomed of peace, and shall take the ensuing oath, viz. You shall swear, that as justice of the Peace, Oyer and Terminer, Assizes and Goal-delivery in the counties of A. B. in all articles of the commission to you directed, you shall do equal right to the poor, and to the rich after your cunning and wit and power, and after the laws and customs of the realm, and in pursuance of these articles; and you shall not be of counsel of any quarrel hanging before you; and the issues, fines and amerciements which shall happen to be made, and all forfeitures which shall happen before you, you shall cause to be entred without any concealment or imbezling, and send to the court of exchequer, or to such other place as his majesty's lord-lieutenant, or other chief governor or governors of this kingdom shall appoint, until there may be access unto the said court of exchequer: You shall not lett for gift or other cause, but well and truly you shall do your office of justice of Peace, Oyer and Terminer, Assizes and Goal-delivery in that behalf; and that you take nothing for your office of justice of the Peace, Oyer and Terminer, Assizes, and Goal-delivery to be done, but of the king, and fees accustomed; and you shall not direct, or cause to be directed, any warrant by you, to be made to the parties, but you shall direct them to the sheriffs and bailiffs of the said counties respectively, or other the king's officers or ministers, or other indifferent persons to do execution thereof. So help you God, &c.

And that as well in the said commission, as in all other commissions, and authorities to be issued in pursuance of the present articles, this clause shall be inserted, viz. That all officers, civil and martial, shall be required to be aiding and assisting and obedient unto the said commissioners, and other persons, to be authorized as aforesaid in the execution of their respective powers.

XXIX. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is further graciously pleased, That his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects do continue the possession of such of his majesty's cities, garisons, towns, forts and castles which are within their now quarters, until settlement by parliament, and to be commanded, ruled and governed in chief, upon occasion of necessity (as to the martial and military affairs) by such as his majesty, or his chief governor or governors of this kingdom for the time being, shall appoint; and the said appointment to be by and with the advice and consent of the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, &c. or any seven or more of them; and his majesty's chief governor, or governors, is to issue commissions accordingly to such persons as shall be so named and appointed as aforesaid, for the executing of such command, rule or government, to continue until all the particulars in these present articles agreed on to pass in parliament, shall be accordingly passed; only in case of death or misbehaviour, such other person or persons to be appointed for the said command, rule or government, to be named and appointed in the place or places, of him or them, who shall so die or misbehave themselves, as the chief governor or governors for the time being, by the advice and consent of the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, &c. or any seven or more of them shall think fit, and to be continued until a settlement in parliament as aforesaid.

XXX. Item, It is further concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is further graciously pleased, That all customs and tenths of prizes belonging to his majesty, which from the perfection of these articles shall fall due within this kingdom, shall be paid unto his majesty's receipt, or until recourse may be had thereunto in the ordinary legal way, unto such person or persons, and in such place or

places, and under such controuls as the lord lieutenant shall appoint to be disposed of, in order to the defence and safety of the kingdom, and the defraying of other the necessary public charges thereof, for the ease of the subjects in other their levies, charges and applotments. And that all and every person or persons, who are at present entrusted and employed by the said Roman Catholics, in the entries, receipts, collections, or otherwise, concerning the said customs and tenths of prizes, do continue their respective employments in the same, until full settlement in parliament, accountable to his majesty's receipts, or until recourse may be had thereunto; as the said lord lieutenant shall appoint as aforesaid, other than to such, and so many of them, as to the chief governor or governors for the time being, by and with the advice and consent of the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, &c. or any seven or more of them, shall be thought fit to be altered; and then, and in such case, or in case of death, fraud or misbehaviour, or other alteration of any such person or persons, then such other person or persons to be employed therein, as shall be thought fit by the chief governor or governors for the time being, by and with the advice and consent of the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, &c. or any seven or more of them; and when it shall appear that any person or persons, who shall be found faithful to his majesty, hath right to any of the offices or places about the said customs, whereunto he or they may not be admitted until settlement in parliament as aforesaid, that a reasonable compensation shall be afforded to such person or persons for the same.

XXXI. Item, As for and concerning his majesty's rents, payable at Easter next, and from thenceforth to grow due, until a settlement in parliament, it is concluded, accorded and agreed upon, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is graciously pleased, That the said rents be not written for, or levied, until a full settlement in parliament; and in due time upon application to be made to the said lord lieutenant, or other chief governor or governors of this kingdom, by the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, &c. or any seven or more of them, for remittal of those rents, the said lord lieutenant, or any other chief governor or governors of this kingdom for the time being, shall intimate their desires, and the reason thereof to his majesty, who upon consideration of the present condition of this kingdom will declare his gracious pleasure therein, as shall be just and honourable, and satisfactory to the reasonable desires of his subjects.

XXXII. Item, It is concluded, accorded and agreed, by and between the said parties, and his majesty is graciously pleased, That the commissioners of Oyer and Terminer and Gaol-delivery to be named as aforesaid, shall have power to hear and determine all murders, manslaughters, rapes, stealths, burning of houses and corn in rick or stack, robberies, burglaries, forcible entries, detainers of possessions, and other offences committed or done, and to be committed and done since the first day of May last past, until the first day of the next parliament, these present articles, or any thing therein contained to the contrary notwithstanding; provided that the authority of the said commissioners shall not extend to question any person or persons, for doing or committing any act whatsoever, before the conclusion of this treaty, by virtue or colour of any warrant or direction from those in public authority among the confederate Roman Catholics, nor unto any Act which shall be done after the perfecting and concluding of these articles, by virtue or pretence of any authority which is now by these articles agreed on; provided also that the said commission shall not continue longer than the first day of the next parliament.

XXXIII. Item, It is concluded, accorded by and between the said parties, and his majesty is further graciously pleased, That for the determining such differences which may arise between his majesty's subjects within this kingdom, and the prevention of inconvenience and disquiet which through want of due remedy in several causes may happen, there shall

shall be judicatures established in this kingdom, and that the persons to be authorized in them, shall have power to do all such things as shall be proper and necessary for them to do; and the said lord lieutenant, by and with the advice and consent of the said Thomas lord viscount Dillon of Costologh lord president of Connaght, Donnogh lord viscount Muskerry, Francis lord baron of Athunry, &c. or any seven or more of them, shall name the said persons so to be authorized, and do all other things incident unto, and necessary for the settling of the said intended judicatures.

XXXIV. Item, At the instance, humble suit and earnest desire of the general assembly of the confederate Roman Catholics, it is concluded, accorded and agreed upon, that the Roman Catholic regular clergy of this kingdom, behaving themselves conformable to these articles of peace, shall not be molested in the possessions which at present they have of, and in the bodies, sites and precincts of such Abbeyes and Monasteries belonging to any Roman Catholic within the said kingdom, until settlement by parliament; and that the said clergy shall not be molested in the enjoying such pensions, as hitherto since the wars they enjoyed for their respective livelihoods from the said Roman Catholics: and the sites and precincts hereby intended, are declared to be the body of the Abbey, one Garden and Orchard to each Abbey, if any there be, and what else is contained within the walls, meers, or ancient fences or ditch, that doth supply the wall thereof, and no more.

XXXV. Item, It is concluded, accorded and agreed, by and between the said parties, that as to all other demands of the said Roman Catholics, for or concerning all or any the matters proposed by them, not granted or assented unto in and by the aforesaid articles, the said Roman Catholics be referred to his majesty's gracious favour and further concessions. In witness whereof the said lord lieutenant, for and on the behalf of his most excellent majesty, to the one part of these articles remaining with the said Roman Catholics, hath put his hand and seal: And Sir Richard Blake knt. in the chair of the general assembly of the said Roman Catholics, by order, command and unanimous consent of the said Catholics in full assembly, to the other part thereof remaining with the said lord lieutenant, hath put to his hand and the Public seal hitherto used by the said Roman Catholics, the 17th of January 1648, and in the 24th year of the reign of our sovereign Lord CHARLES, by the Grace of God, King of Great-Britain, France and Ireland, &c.

S I R,

I HAVE not thus long forborne to invite you with those under your command, to a submission to his majesty's authority in me, and a conjunction with me, in the ways of his service, out of any the least aversion I had to you, or any of them, or out of any disesteem I had to your power, to advance or impede the same; but out of my fear, whiles those that have of late usurped power over the subjects of England, held forth the least colourable shadow of moderation in their intentions towards the settlement of church or state, and that in some tolerable way with relation to religion, the interest of the king and crown, the freedom of parliament, the liberties of the subject, any addresses from me proposing the withdrawing of that party from those thus professing, from whom they have received some, and expected further support, would have been but coldly received, and any determination thereupon deferred in hope and expectation of the forementioned settlement; or that you yourself, who certainly have not wanted a foresight of the sad confusion now covering the face of England, would have declared with me, the Lord Inchequeen, and the Protestant army in Munster, in prevention thereof; yet my fear was, it would have been as difficult for you, to have carried with you the main body of the army under your command (not so clear-sighted as yourself) as it would have been dangerous to you, and those with you well-inclined to have attempted it without them; but now that the mask of hypocrisy, by which the independent army

hath

hath ensnared and enslaved all estates and degrees of men, is laid aside, now that barefaced, they evidently appear to be the subverters of true religion, and to be the protectors and inviters not only of all false ones, but of irreligion and atheism, now that they have barbarously and inhumanly laid violent, sacrilegious hands upon, and murdered God's anointed, and our king, not as heretofore some patricides have done, to make room for some usurper, but in a way plainly manifesting their intentions, to change the monarchy of England into anarchy, unless their aim be first to constitute an elective kingdom; and Cromwel or some such John of Leiden being elected, then by the same force, by which they have thus far compassed their ends, to establish a perfect Turkish tyranny; now that of the three estates of king, lords and commons, whereof in all ages parliaments have consisted, there remains only a small number, and they the dregs and scum of the house of commons, picked and awed by the army, a wicked remnant, left for no other end, than yet further if it be possible to delude the people with the name of a parliament: The king being murdered, the lords and the rest of the commons being by unheard of violence at several times forced from the houses, and some imprisoned. And now that there remains no other liberty in the subject but to profess blasphemous opinions, to revile and tread under foot magistracy, to murder magistrates, and oppress and undo all that are not like-minded with them. Now I say, that I cannot doubt but that you and all with you under your command will take this opportunity to act and declare against so monstrous and unparalleled a rebellion, and that you and they will chearfully acknowledge, and faithfully serve and obey our gracious king Charles II. undoubted heir of his father's crown and virtues; under whose right and conduct we may by God's assistance restore protestant religion to purity, and therein settle it, parliaments to their freedom, good laws to their force, and our fellow-subjects to their just liberties; wherein how glorious and blessed a thing it will be, to be so considerably instrumental, as you may now make yourself, I leave to you now to consider. And though I conceive there are not any motives relating to some particular interest to be mentioned after these so weighty considerations, which are such as the world hath not been at any time furnished with; yet I hold it my part to assure you, that as there is nothing you can reasonably propose for the safety, satisfaction or advantage of yourself, or of any that shall adhere to you in what I desire, that I shall not to the uttermost of my power provide for; so there is nothing I would, nor shall more industriously avoid, than those necessities arising from my duty to God and Man, that may by your rejecting this offer force me to be a sad instrument of shedding English blood, which in such case must on both sides happen. If this overture find place with you, as I earnestly wish it may, let me know with what possible speed you can, and if you please by the bearer in what way you desire, it shall be drawn on to a conclusion. For in that, as well as in the substance, you shall find all ready compliance from me, that desire to be

CARRICK,

March 9,

1648.

Your affectionate friend to serve you,

ORMOND.

For Colonel Michael Jones

Governor of DUBLIN.

My

MY LORD,

YOUR lordship's of the ninth I received the twelfth instant, and therein have I your lordship's invitation to a conjunction with yourself (I suppose) as lord lieutenant of Ireland, and with others now united with the Irish, and with the Irish themselves also.

As I understand not how your lordship should be invested with that power pretended, so am I very well assured, that it is not in the power of any without the parliament of England to give and assure pardon to those bloody rebels, as by the act to that end passed may appear more fully. I am also well assured, that the parliament of England would never assent to such a Peace (such as is that of your lordship's with the rebels) wherein is little or no provision made either for the protestants or the protestant religion. Nor can I understand how the protestant religion should be settled and restored to its purity by an army of papists, or the protestant interests maintained by those very enemies by whom they have been spoiled and there slaughtered: And very evident it is, that both the protestants and protestant religion are in that your lordship's treaty, left as in the power of the rebels, to be by them borne down and rooted out at pleasure.

As for that consideration by your lordship offered of the present and late proceedings in England, I see not how it may be a sufficient motive to me (or any other in like trust for the parliament of England in the service of the kingdom) to join with those rebels upon any the pretences in that your lordship's letter mentioned; for therein were there a manifest betraying that trust reposed in me, in deserting the service and work committed to me, in joining with those I shall oppose, and in opposing whom I am obliged to serve.

Neither conceive I it any part of my work and care to take notice of any whatsoever proceedings of State, foreign to my charge and trust here, especially they being found hereunto apparently destructive.

Most certain it is, and former ages have approved it, that the intermeddling of governors and parties in this kingdom, with sidings and parties in England, have been the very betraying of this kingdom to the Irish, whiles the British forces here had been thereupon called off, and the place therein laid open, and as it were given up to the common Enemy.

It is what your lordship might have observed in your former treaty with the rebels, that upon your lordship's thereupon withdrawing, and sending hence into England the most considerable part of the English army then commanded by you; thereby was the remaining British party not long after overpower'd, and your quarters by the Irish overrun to the gates of Dublin, yourself also reduced to that low condition, as to be besieged in this very city (the metropolis and principal citadel of the kingdom) and that by those rebels, who till then could never stand before you: and what the end hath been of that party, also so sent by your lordship into England (although the flower and strength of the English army here, both officers and soldiers) hath been very observable.

And how much the dangers are at present (more than in former ages) of hazarding the English interest in this kingdom, by sending any parties hence into any other kingdom upon any pretences whatsoever, is very apparent, as in the generality of the rebellion, now more than formerly; so considering your lordship's present conclusions with, and concessions to the rebels, wherein they are allowed the continual possession of all the cities, forts and places of strength, whereof they stood possessed at the time of their treaty with your lordship, and that they are to have a standing force (if I well remember) of 15000 foot and 2500 horse (all of their own party, officers and soldiers) and they

(with the whole kingdom) to be regulated by a major part of Irish trustees, chosen by the rebels themselves, as persons for their interests and ends, to be by them confided in, without whom nothing is to be acted. Therein I cannot but mind your lordship of what hath been sometimes by yourself delivered, as your sense in this particular; that the English interest in Ireland must be preserved by the English, and not by Irish; and upon that ground (if I be not deceived) did your lordship then capitulate with the parliament of England, from which clear principle I am sorry to see your lordship now receding.

As to that by your lordship menaced us here, of blood and force, if dissenting from your lordship's ways and designs, for my particular I shall (my lord) much rather chuse to suffer in so doing (for therein shall I do what is becoming, and answerable to my trust) than to purchase myself on the contrary the ignominious brand of perfidy by any allurements of whatsoever advantages offered me.

But very confident I am of the same divine power which hath still followed me in this Work, and will still follow me; and in that trust doubt nothing of thus giving your lordship plainly this my resolution in that particular: So I remain,

DUBLIN,

March 14.

1648.

Your Lordship's humble Servant.

Signed, MIC. JONES.

For the Lord of ORMOND these.

BY

BY THE
Lord Lieutenant General
OF

IRELAND.

ORMOND,

WHEREAS our late sovereign lord king Charles of happy memory hath been lately by a party of his rebellious subjects of England most traiterously, maliciously, and inhumanly put to death and murdered; and forasmuch as his majesty that now is, Charles by the grace of God king of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, is son and heir of his said late majesty, and therefore by the laws of the land, of force, and practised in all ages, is to inherit. We therefore in discharge of the duty we owe unto God, our allegiance and loyalty to our sovereign, holding it fit him so to proclaim in and through this his majesty's kingdom, do by this our present proclamation declare and manifest to the world, That Charles II. son and heir of our sovereign lord king Charles I. of happy memory, is, by the grace of God, the undoubted king of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, defender of the Faith, &c.

Given at Carrick, Feb. 26. 1648.

GOD SAVE THE KING.

Vol. I.

D d d

A nc-

A
NECESSARY REPRESENTATION
OF THE
PRESENT EVILS

And imminent dangers to religion, laws and liberties, arising from the late and present practices of the Sectarian Party in England: together with an exhortation to duties relating to the Covenant, unto all within our charge, and to all the well-affected within this kingdom, by the Presbytery at Belfast, February the 15th, 1649.

WHEN we seriously consider the great and many duties which we owe unto God and his people, over whom he hath made us overseers, and for whom we must give an account; and when we behold the laudable examples of the worthy ministers of the province of London, and of the commissioners of the general assembly of the church of Scotland, in their free and faithful testimonies against the insolencies of the Sectarian Party in England: considering also the dependency of this kingdom upon the kingdom of England, and remembering how against strong oppositions we were assisted by the Lord the last year in discharge of the like duty, and how he punished the contempt of our warning upon the despisers thereof: we find ourselves as necessitated, so the more encouraged to cast in our mite in the treasury, lest our silence should involve us in the guilt of unfaithfulness, and our people in security and neglect of duties.

In this discharge of the trust put upon us by God, we would not be looked upon as sowers of sedition, or broachers of national and divisive motions; our record is in heaven, that nothing is more hateful unto us, nor less intended by us, and therefore we shall not fear the malicious and wicked aspersions which we know Satan by his instruments is ready to cast, not only upon us, but on all who sincerely endeavour the advancement of reformation.

What of late have been, and now are, the insolent and presumptuous practices of the Sectaries in England, is not unknown to the world: for, First, notwithstanding their specious pretences for religion and liberties, yet their late and present actings being therewith compared, do clearly evidence that they love a rough garment to deceive; since they have with a high hand despised the Oath, in breaking the covenant, which is so strong a foundation to both, whilst they load it with slighting reproaches, calling it a bundle of particular and contrary interests, and a snare to the people; and likewise labour to establish by laws an universal toleration of all religions, which is an innovation overturning of unity in religion, and so directly repugnant to the word of God, the two first articles of our solemn covenant, which is the greatest wickedness in them to violate, since many of the chiefest of themselves have, with their hands testified to the most high God, sworn and sealed it.

Moreover, their great disaffection to the settlement of religion, and so their future breach of covenant, doth more fully appear by their strong oppositions to Presbyterian government (the hedge and bulwark of religion) whilst they express their hatred to it more than

than to the worst of errors, by excluding it under the name of compulsion; when they embrace even Paganism and Judaism in the arms of toleration. Not to speak of their aspersions upon it, and the assertors thereof as antichristian and Popish, though they have deeply sworn to maintain the same government in the first article of the covenant, as it is established in the church of Scotland, which they now so despitefully blaspheme.

Again, it is more than manifest, that they seek not the vindication, but the extirpation of laws and liberties, as appears by their seizing on the person of the king, and at their pleasures removing him from place to place, not only without the consent, but (if we mistake not) against a direct ordinance of parliament: Their violent surprising, imprisoning and secluding many of the most worthy members of the honourable house of commons, directly against a declared privilege of parliament, (an action certainly without parallel in any age) and their purposes of abolishing parliamentary power for the future, and establishing of a representative (as they call it) instead thereof. Neither hath their fury staid here, but without all rule or example, being but private men, they have proceeded to the trial of the king, against both interest and protestation of the kingdom of Scotland, and the former public declarations of both kingdoms (besides the violent haste, rejecting the hearing of any defences) with cruel hands have put him to death; an act so horrible, as no history, divine or human, hath laid a precedent of the like.

These and many other their detestable insolencies, may abundantly convince every unbiassed judgment, that the present practice of the sectaries and their abettors, do directly overturn the laws and liberties of the kingdoms, root out lawful and supreme magistracy (the just privileges whereof we have sworn to maintain) and introduce a fearful confusion and lawless anarchy.

The spirit of God by Solomon tells us, Prov. xxx. 21. That a servant to reign, is one of the four things for which the earth is disquieted, and which it cannot bear: We wonder nothing that the earth is disquieted for these things; but we wonder greatly, if the earth can bear them. And albeit the Lord so permit, that folly be set in great dignity, and they which sit in low place; "that servants ride upon horses, and princes walk as servants upon the earth," Eccles. x. ver. 6, 7. Yet the same wise man saith, Prov. xix. "Delight is not seemly for a fool, much less for a servant to have rule over princes."

When we consider these things, we cannot but declare and manifest our utter dislike and detestation of such unwarrantable practices, directly subverting our covenant, religion, laws and liberties. And as watchmen in Sion warn all the lovers of truth and well-affected to the covenant, carefully to avoid compliance with, or not bearing witness against horrid insolencies, lest partaking with them in their sins, they also be partakers of their plagues. Therefore in the spirit of meekness, we earnestly intreat, and in the authority of Jesus Christ (whose servants we are) charge and obtest all who resolve to adhere unto truth and the covenant, diligently to observe and conscientiously to perform these following duties.

First, That according to our solemn covenant, every one study more the power of godliness and personal reformation of themselves and families; because for the great breach of this part of the covenant, God is highly offended with these lands, and justly provoked to permit men to be the instruments of our misery and afflictions.

Secondly, That every one in their station and calling earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints, Jude iii. And seek to have their hearts established with grace, that they be not unstable and wavering, carried about with every wind of doctrine; but that they receive the truth in love, avoiding the company of such as withdraw from and vilify the public ordinances; speak evil of church-government; invent damnable errors, under the specious pretence of a gospel-way and new light; and highly

extol the persons and courses of notorious sectaries, lest God give them over to strong delusions (the plague of these times) that they may believe lies, and be damned.

Thirdly, That they would not be drawn by counsel, command or example, to shake off the ancient and fundamental government of these kingdoms by king and parliament, which we are so deeply engaged to preserve by our solemn covenant, as they would not be found guilty of the great evil of these times (condemned by the Holy Ghost) the despising of dominion and speaking evil of dignities.

Fourthly, That they do cordially endeavour the preservation of the union amongst the well-affected in the kingdoms, not being swayed by any national respect: Remembring that part of the covenant; "that we shall not suffer ourselves directly nor indirectly, by whatsoever combination, persuation or terror, to be divided or withdrawn from this blessed union and conjunction."

And Finally, Albeit there be more present hazard from the power of sectaries (as were from malignants the last year) yet we are not ignorant of the evil purposes of malignants, even at this time, in all the kingdoms, and particularly in this; and for this cause, we exhort every one with equal watchfulness to keep themselves free from associating with such, or from swerving in their judgments to malignant principles; and to avoid all such persons as have been from the beginning known opposers of reformation, refusers of the covenant, combining themselves with papists and other notorious malignants, especially such who have been chief promoters of the late engagement against England, calumniators of the work of reformation, in reputing the miseries of the present times unto the advancers thereof; and that their just hatred to sectaries incline not their minds to favour malignants, or to think, that because of the power of sectaries, the cause of God needs the more to fear the enmity, or to stand in need of the help of malignants.

OBSERVATIONS

UPON THE
ARTICLES of PEACE with the Irish Rebels, on the
Letter of ORMOND to Colonel JONES, and the Representation of
the Presbytery at Belfast.

ALthough it be a maxim much agreeable to wisdom, that just deeds are the best answer to injurious words, and actions, of whatever sort, their own plainest interpreters; yet since our enemies can find the leisure both ways to offend us, it will be requisite we should be found in neither of those ways neglectful of our just defence: to let them know, that sincere and upright intentions can certainly with as much ease deliver themselves into words as into deeds.

Having therefore seen of late those articles of peace granted to the papist rebels of Ireland, as special graces and favours from the late king, in reward, most likely, of their work done, and in his name and authority confirmed and ratified by James earl of Ormond; together with his letter to colonel Jones, governor of Dublin, full of contumely and dishonour, both to the parliament and army: and on the other side, an insolent and seditious representation from the Scots presbytery at Belfast in the North of Ireland, no less dishonourable to the state, and much about the same time brought hither: there will be needful as to the same slanderous aspersions but one and the same vindication against them both. Nor can we sever them in our notice and resentment, though one part intitled a presbytery, and would be thought a protestant assembly, since their own unexampled virulence hath wrapt them into the same guilt, made them accomplices and assistants to the abhorred Irish rebels, and with them at present to advance the same interest: if we consider both their calumnies, their hatred, and the pretended reasons of their hatred to be the same; the time also, and the place concurring, as that there lacks nothing but a few formal words, which may be easily dissembled, to make the perfectest conjunction; and between them to divide that island.

As for these articles of peace made with those inhuman rebels and papists of Ireland by the late king, as one of his last master-pieces, we may be confidently persuaded, that no true-born Englishman can so much as barely read them without indignation and disdain, that those bloody rebels, and so proclaimed and judged of by the king himself, after the merciless and barbarous massacre of so many thousand English, (who had used their right and title to that country with such tenderness and moderation, and might otherwise have secured themselves with ease against their treachery) should be now graced and rewarded with such freedoms and enlargements, as none of their ancestors could ever merit by their best obedience, which at best was always treacherous; to be enfranchised with full liberty equal to their conquerors, whom the just revenge of ancient pyracies, cruel captivities, and the causeless infestation of our coast, had warrantably called over, and the long prescription of many hundred years; besides what other titles are acknowledged by their own Irish parliaments, had fixed and seated in that soil with as good a right as the meekest natives.

These therefore by their own foregoing demerits and provocations justly made our vassals, are by the first article of this peace advanced to a condition of freedom superior to what any English protestants durst have demanded. For what else can be the meaning to discharge them the common oath of supremacy, especially being papists (for whom principally that oath was intended) but either to resign them the more into their own power or

to set a mark of dishonour upon the British loyalty; by trusting Irish rebels for one single oath of allegiance, as much as all his subjects of Britain for the double swearing both of allegiance and supremacy?

The second article puts it into the hands of an Irish parliament to repeal, or to suspend, if they think convenient, the act usually called Poyning's Act, which was the main, and yet the civilest and most moderate acknowledgment imposed of their dependance on the crown of England; whereby no parliament could be summoned there, no bill be past, but what was first to be transmitted and allowed under the great seal of England. The recalling of which act, tends openly to invest them with a law-giving power of their own, enables them by degrees to throw off all subjection to this realm, and renders them (who by their endless treasons and revolts have deserved to hold no parliament at all, but to be governed by edicts and garisons) as absolute and supreme in that assembly as the people of England in their own land. And the twelfth article grants them in express words, that the Irish parliament shall be no more dependent on the parliament of England, than the Irish themselves shall declare agreeable to the laws of Ireland.

The two and twentieth article, more ridiculous than dangerous, coming especially from such a serious knot of lords and politicians, obtains that those acts prohibiting to plow with horses by the tail, and burn oats in the straw, be repealed; enough, if nothing else, to declare in them a disposition not only sottish, but indocible, and averse from all civility and amendment: and what hopes they give for the future, who rejecting the ingenuity of all other nations to improve and wax more civil by a civilizing conquest, though all these many years better shown and taught, prefer their own absurd and savage customs before the most convincing evidence of reason and demonstration: a testimony of their true barbarism and obdurate wilfulness, to be expected no less in other matters of greatest moment.

Yet such as these and thus affected, the ninth article entrusts with the militia; a trust which the king swore by God at New-Market, he would not commit to his parliament of England, no not for an hour. And well declares the confidence he had in Irish rebels, more than in his loyallest subjects. He grants them moreover, till the performance of all these articles, that fifteen thousand foot and two thousand five hundred horse shall remain a standing army of papists at the beck and command of Dillon, Muskerry, and other arch-rebels, with power also of adding to that number as they shall see cause. And by other articles allows them the constituting of magistrates and judges in all causes, whom they think fit: and till a settlement to their own minds, the possession of all those towns and countries within their new quarters, being little less than all the island, besides what their cruelty hath dispeopled and laid waste. And lastly, the whole managing both of peace and war is committed to papists, and the chief leaders of that rebellion.

Now let all men judge what this wants of utter alienating and acquitting the whole province of Ireland from all true fealty and obedience to the commonwealth of England. Which act of any king against the consent of his parliament, though no other crime were laid against him, might of itself strongly conduce to the dis-inthroning him of all. In France, Henry the Third, demanding leave in greatest exigencies to make sale of some crown-lands only, and that to his subjects, was answered by the parliament then at Blois, that a king in no case, though of extremest necessity, might alienate the patrimony of his crown, whereof he is but only Ufu. fructuary, as civilians term it, the propriety remaining ever to the kingdom, not to the king. And in our own nation, king John, for resigning though unwillingly his crown to the pope's legate, with little more hazard to his kingdom than the payment of one thousand marks, and the unsightliness of such a ceremony, was deposed by his barons, and Lewis the French king's son elected in his room. And to have carried only the jewels, plate, and treasure into Ireland without consent of the nobility, was one of those impeachments that condemned Richard the Second to lose his crown.

But

But how petty a crime this will seem to the alienating of a whole kingdom, which in these articles of peace we see as good as done by the late king, not to friends, but to mortal enemies, to the accomplishment of his own interests and ends, wholly separate from the people's good, may without aggravation be easily conceived. Nay, by the covenant itself, since that so cavillously is urged against us, we are enjoined in the fourth article, with all faithfulness to endeavour the bringing all such to public trial and condign punishment, as shall divide one kingdom from another. And what greater dividing than by a pernicious and hostile peace, to disalliege a whole feudary kingdom from the ancient dominion of England? Exception we find there of no person whatsoever; and if the king, who hath actually done this, or any for him claim a privilege above justice, it is again demanded by what express law either of God or man, and why he whose office is to execute law and justice upon all others, should set himself like a demi-god in lawless and unbounded Anarchy; refusing to be accountable for that authority over men naturally his equals, which God himself without a reason given is not wont to exercise over his creatures? And if God the nearer to be acquainted with mankind and his frailties, and to become our priest, made himself a man, and subject to the law, we gladly would be instructed why any mortal man for the good and welfare of his brethren being made a king, should by a clean contrary motion make himself a god, exalted above law; the readiest way to become utterly unsensible, both of his human condition, and his own duty.

And how securely, how smoothly, with how little touch or sense of any commiseration, either princely or so much as human, he hath sold away that justice so oft demanded, and so oft by himself acknowledged to be due for the blood of more than two hundred thousand of his subjects, that never hurt him, never disobeyed him, assassinated and cut in pieces by those Irish barbarians, to give the first promoting, as is more than thought, to his own tyrannical designs in England, will appear by the eighteenth article of his peace; wherein without the least regard of justice to avenge the dead, while he thirsts to be avenged upon the living, to all the murders, massacres, treasons, pyracies, from the very fatal day wherein that rebellion first broke out, he grants an act of oblivion. If this can be justified, or not punished in whomsoever, while there is any faith, any religion, any justice upon earth, there can no reason be alledged why all things are not left to confusion. And thus much be observed in brief concerning these articles of peace made by the late king with his Irish rebels.

The letter of Ormond sent to colonel Jones governor of Dublin, attempting his fidelity, which the discretion and true worth of that gentleman hath so well answered and repulsed, had passed here without mention, but that the other part of it not content to do the errand of treason, roves into a long digression of evil and reproachful language to the parliament and army of England. Which though not worth their notice, as from a crew of rebels whose inhumanities are long since become the horror and execration of all that hear them, yet in the pursuance of a good endeavour, to give the world all due satisfaction of the present doings, no opportunity shall be omitted.

He accuses first, "That we are the subverters of religion, the protectors and inviters not only of all false ones, but of irreligion and atheism." An accusation that no man living could more unjustly use than our accuser himself; and which without a strange besottedness, he could not expect but to be retorted upon his own head. All men who are true protestants, of which number he gives out to be one, know not a more immediate and killing subverter of all true religion than antichrist, whom they generally believe to be the pope and church of Rome; he therefore who makes peace with this grand enemy and persecutor of the true church, he who joins with him, strengthens him, gives him root to grow up and spread his poison, removing all opposition against him, granting him schools, abbeys, and revenues, garisons, towns, fortresses, as in so many of those articles may be seen, he of all protestants may be called most justly the subverter of true religion, the protector and inviter of irreligion and atheism, whether it be Ormond or his master. And if it can be

no way proved, that the parliament hath countenanced popery or papists, but have every where broken their temporal power, thrown down their public superstitions, and confined them to the bare enjoyment of that which is not in our reach, their consciences; if they have encouraged all true ministers of the gospel, that is to say, afforded them favour and protection in all places where they preached, and although they think not money or stipend to be the best encouragement of a true pastor, yet therein also have not been wanting nor intend to be, they doubt not then to affirm themselves, not the subverters, but the maintainers and defenders of true religion; which of itself and by consequence is the surest and the strongest subversion, not only of all false ones, but of irreligion and atheism. For "the weapons of that warfare," as the apostle testifies, who best knew, "are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong-holds, and all reasonings, and every high thing exalted against the knowledge of God, surprising every thought unto the obedience of Christ, and easily revenging all disobedience," 2 Cor. x. What minister or clergyman that either understood his high calling, or sought not to erect a secular and carnal tyranny over spiritual things, would neglect this ample and sublime power conferred upon him, and come a begging to the weak hand of magistracy for that kind of aid which the magistrate hath no commission to afford him, and in the way he seeks it hath been always found helpless and unprofitable. Neither is it unknown, or by wisest men unobserved, that the Church began then most apparently to degenerate, and go to ruin, when she borrowed of the civil power more than fair encouragement and protection; more than which Christ himself and his Apostles never required. To say therefore, that we protect and invite all false religions, with irreligion also and atheism, because we lend not, or rather misapply not the temporal power to help out, though in vain, the sloth, the spleen, the insufficiency of church-men, in the execution of spiritual discipline, over those within their charge, or those without, is an imputation that may be laid as well upon the best-regulated states and governments through the world: Who have been so prudent as never to employ the civil sword further than the edge of it could reach, that is, to civil offences only; proving always against objects that were spiritual a ridiculous weapon. Our protection therefore to men in civil matters unoffensive we cannot deny; their consciences we leave, as not within our cognizance, to the proper cure of instruction, praying for them. Nevertheless, if any be found among us declared atheists, malicious enemies of God, and of Christ; the parliament, I think, professes not to tolerate such, but with all befitting endeavours to suppress them. Otherways to protect none that in a larger sense may be taxed of irreligion and atheism, may perhaps be the ready way to exclude none sooner out of protection, than those themselves that most accuse it to be so general to others. Lastly, that we invite such as these, or encourage them, is a meer slander without proof.

He tells us next, that they have murdered the king. And they deny not to have justly and undauntedly, as became the parliament of England, for more blood-shed and other heinous crimes than ever king of this land was guilty of, after open trial, punished him with death. A matter which to men whose serious consideration thereof hath left no certain precept, or example undebated, is so far from giving offence, that we implore and beseech the divine majesty so to uphold and support their spirits with like fortitude and magnanimity, that all their ensuing actions may correspond and prove worthy that impartial and noble piece of justice, wherein the hand of God appeared so evidently on our side. We shall not then need to fear what all the rout and faction of men basely principled can do against us.

The end of our proceedings, which he takes upon him to have discovered, "the changing forsooth of monarchy into anarchy," sounds so like the smattering of some raw politician, and the overworn objection of every trivial talker, that we leave him in the number. But seeing in that which follows he contains not himself, but contrary to what a gentleman should know of civility, proceeds to the contemptuous naming of a person, whose valour and high merit many enemies more noble than himself have both honoured
and

and feared ; to assert his good name and reputation, of whose service the commonwealth receives so ample satisfaction, it is answered in his behalf, that Cromwell whom he couples with a name of scorn, hath done in few years more eminent and remarkable deeds whereon to found nobility in his house, though it were wanting, and perpetual renown to posterity, than Ormond and all his ancestors put together can shew from any record of their Irish exploits, the widest scene of their glory.

He passes on his groundless conjectures, that the aim of this parliament may be perhaps to set up first an elective kingdom, and after that a perfect Turkish tyranny. Of the former, we suppose the late act against monarchy will suffice to acquit them. Of the latter, certainly there needed no other pattern than that tyranny which was so long modelling by the late king himself, with Strafford, and that arch-prelate of Canterbury, his chief instruments ; whose designs God hath dissipated. Neither is it any new project of the monarchs, and their courtiers in these days, though christians they would be thought, to endeavour the introducing of a plain Turkish tyranny. Witness that consultation had in the court of France under Charles the IXth at Blois, wherein Poncet, a certain court-projector, brought in secretly by the chancellor Biragha, after many praises of the Ottoman government, proposes means and ways at large, in presence of the king, the queen regent, and Anjou the king's brother, how with best expedition, and least noise the Turkish tyranny might be set up in France. It appears therefore that the design of bringing in that tyranny, is a monarchical design, and not of those who have dissolved monarchy.

As for parliaments by three estates, we know that a parliament signifies no more than the supreme and general council of a nation, consisting of whomsoever chosen and assembled for the publick good ; which was ever practised, and in all sorts of government, before the word Parliament, or the formality, or the possibility of those three estates, or such a thing as a titular monarchy had either name or being in the world. The original of all which we could produce to be far newer than those "all Ages" which he vaunts of, and by such first invented and contrived, whose authority, though it were Charles Martell, stands not so high in our repute, either for himself, or the age he lived in, but that with as good warrant we may recede from what he ordained, as he ordain what before was not.

But whereas besides he is bold to alledge that of the three estates there remains only a small number, and they the "Dregs and scum of the house of commons ;" this reproach, and in the mouth of an Irishman, concerns not them only ; but redounds to apparent dishonour of the whole English nation. Doubtless there must be thought a great scarcity in England of persons honourable and deserving, or else of judgment, or so much as honesty in the people, if those whom they esteem worthy to sit in parliament, be no better than scum and dregs in the Irish dialect. But of such like stuff we meet not any where with more excrescence than in his own lavish pen ; which feeling itself loose without the reins of discretion, rambles for the most part beyond all soberness and civility. In which torrent he goes on negotiating and cheapning the loyalty of our faithful governor of Dublin, as if the known and tried constancy of that valiant gentleman were to be bought with court-fumes.

He lays before him, that 'there remains now no other liberty in the subject but to profess blasphemous opinions, to revile and tread under foot magistracy, to murder magistrates, to oppress and undo all that are not like-minded with us. Forgetting in the mean while himself to be in the head of a mixed rabble, part papists, part fugitives, and part savages, guilty in the highest degree of all these crimes. What more blasphemous, not opinion, but whole religion, than popery, plunged into idolatrous and ceremonial superstition, the very death of all true religion ; figured to us by the scripture itself in the shape of that beast, full of the names of Blasphemy, which we mention to him as to one that would be counted protestant, and had his breeding in the house of a bishop ?

And who are those that have trod under foot magistracy, murdered magistrates, oppressed and undone all that sided not with them, but the Irish rebels, in that horrible conspiracy, for which Ormond himself hath either been or seemed to be their enemy, though now their ringleader. And let him ask the jesuits about him, whether it be not their known doctrine and also practice, not by fair and due process of justice to punish kings and magistrates, which we disavow not, but to murder them in the basest and most assassinous manner, if their church-interest so require. There will not need more words to this windy railer, convicted openly of all those crimes which he so confidently, and yet falsely charges upon others.

We have now to deal, though in the same country, with another sort of adversaries, in show far different, in substance much-what the same. These write themselves the presbytery of Belfast, a place better known by the name of a late barony, than by the fame of these men's doctrine or ecclesiastical deeds; whose obscurity till now never came to our hearing. And surely we should think this their representment far beneath considerable, who have neglected and past over the like unadvisedness of their fellows in other places more near us, were it not to observe in some particulars the sympathy, good intelligence, and joint pace which they go in the north of Ireland, with their copartnering rebels in the south, driving on the same interest to lose us that kingdom, that they may gain it themselves, or at least share in the spoil: though the other be open enemies, these pretended brethren.

The introduction of their manifesto out of doubt must be zealous; "Their duty," they say, "to God and his people, over whom he hath made them overseers, and for whom they must give account." What mean these men? Is the presbytery of Belfast, a small town in Ulster, of so large extent, that their voices cannot serve to teach duties in the congregation which they oversee, without spreading and divulging to all parts far beyond the diocess of Patrick or Columba, their written representation, under the subtle pretence of feeding their own flock? Or do they think to oversee, or undertake to give an account for all to whom their paper sends greeting? St. Paul to the elders of Ephesus thinks it sufficient to give charge, "That they take heed to themselves and to the flock over which they were made overseers; beyond those bounds he enlarges not their commission. And surely when we put down bishops and put up presbyters, which the most of them have made use of to enrich and exalt themselves, and turn the first heel against their benefactors, we did not think that one classic fraternity so obscure and so remote, should involve us and all state-affairs, within the censure and jurisdiction of Belfast, upon pretence of overseeing their own charge.

We very well know that church-censures are limited to church-matters, and these within the compass of their own province, or to say more truly of their own congregation: that affairs of state are not for their meddling, as we could urge even from their own invectives and protestations against the bishops, wherein they tell them with much fervency, that ministers of the gospel, neither by that function, nor any other which they ought accept, have the least warrant to be pragmatical in the state.

And surely in vain were bishops for these and other causes forbid to sit and vote in the house, if these men out of the house, and without vote shall claim and be permitted more licence on their presbyterial stools, to breed continual disturbance by interposing in the commonwealth. But seeing that now, since their heaving out the prelates to heave in themselves, they devise new ways to bring both ends together, which will never meet; that is to say, their former doctrine with their present doings, as "that they cannot else teach magistrates and subjects their duty, and that they have besides a right themselves to speak as members of the commonwealth: Let them know that there is a wide difference between the general exhortation to justice and obedience, which in this point is the utmost of their duty, and the state-disputes wherein they are now grown such busy-bodies, to preach of titles, interests and alterations in government; more than our Saviour

Saviour himself, or any of his apostles ever took upon them, though the title both of Cæsar and of Herod, and what they did in matters of state, might have then admitted controversy enough.

Next, for their civil capacities, we are sure that pulpits and church-assemblies, whether classical or provincial, never were intended or allowed by wise magistrates, no nor by him that sent them, to advance such purposes, but that as members of the commonwealth they ought to mix with other commoners, and in that temporal body to assume nothing above other private persons, or otherwise than in a usual and legal manner: not by distinct remonstrances and representations, as if they were a tribe and party by themselves, which is the next immediate way to make the church lift a horn against the state, and claim an absolute and undepending jurisdiction, as from like advantage and occasion (to the trouble of all Christendom) the pope hath for many ages done; and not only our bishops were climbing after him, but our presbyters also, as by late experiment we find. Of this representation therefore we can esteem and judge no other than of a slanderous and seditious libel, sent abroad by a sort of incendiaries to delude and make the better way under the cunning and plausible name of a presbytery.

A second reason of their representing is, "that they consider the dependance of that kingdom upon England, which is another shameless untruth that ever they considered; as their own actions will declare, by conniving, and in their silence partaking with those in Ulster, whose obedience, by what we have yet heard, stands dubious, and with an eye of conformity rather to the north, than to that part where they owe their subjection; and this in all likelihood by the inducement and instigation of these representers: who are so far from considering their dependance on England, as to presume at every word to term proceedings of parliament, "the insolencies of a Sectarian party, and of private men." Despising dominion, and speaking evil of dignities, which hypocritically they would seem to dissuade others from; and not fearing the due correction of their superiors, that may in fit season overtake them. Whenas the least consideration of their dependance on England, would have kept them better in their duty.

The third reason which they use, makes against them; the remembrance how God punished the contempt of their warning last year upon the breakers of covenant, whenas the next year after they forget the warning of that punishment hanging over their own heads for the very same transgression, their manifest breach of covenant by this seditious representation, accompanied with the doubtful obedience of that province which represents it.

And thus we have their preface supported with three reasons; two of them notorious falsities, and the third against themselves; and two examples, 'the Province of London, and the Commissioners of the Kirk-Assembly. But certain, if canonical examples bind not, much less do apocryphal.

Proceeding to avouch the trust put upon them by God, which is plainly proved to be none of this nature, "they would not be looked upon as sowers of sedition, or authors of divisive motions; their record, they say, is in Heaven," and their truth and honesty no man knows where. For is not this a shameless hypocrisy, and of meer wolves in sheeps cloathing, to sow sedition in the ears of all men, and to face us down to the very act, that they are authors of no such matter? But let the sequel both of their paper, and the obedience of the place wherein they are, determine.

Nay, while we are yet writing these things, and foretelling all men the rebellion which was even then designed in the close purpose of these unhallowed priestlings, at the very time when with their lips they disclaimed all sowing of sedition, news is brought, and too true, that the Scottish inhabitants of that province are actually revolted, and have not only besieged in London-Derry those forces which were to have fought against Ormond and the Irish rebels; but have in a manner declared with them, and begun open war against the parliament; and all this by the incitement and illusions of that unchristian

tian synagogue at Belfast, who yet dare charge the parliament, "that notwithstanding specious pretences, yet their actings do evidence that they love a rough garment to deceive." The deceit we own not, but the comparison, by what at first sight may seem alluded, we accept: For that hairy roughness assumed, won Jacob the birthright both temporal and eternal; and God we trust hath so disposed the mouth of these Balaams, that coming to curse, they have stumbled into a kind of blessing, and compared our actings to the faithful act of that patriarch.

But if they mean, as more probably their meaning was, that "rough Garment spoken of Zach. xiii. 4. we may then behold the pitiful store of learning and theology, which these deceivers have thought sufficient to uphold their credit with the people, who, though the rancour that leavens them have somewhat quickned the common drawling of their pulpit elocution, yet for want of stock enough in scripture-phraze to serve the necessary uses of their malice, they are become so liberal, as to part freely with their own budge-gowns from off their backs, and bestow them on the magistrate as a rough Garment to deceive; rather than not be furnished with a reproach, though never so improper, never so obvious to be turned upon themselves. For but with half an eye cast upon that text, any man will soon discern that rough Garment to be their own coat, their own livery, the very badge and cognizance of such false prophets as themselves. Who, when they understand, or ever seriously mind the beginning of that 4th verse, may "be ashamed every one of his lying vision," and may justly fear that foregoing denouncement to such "as speak lies in the name of the Lord, vers. 4. lurking under the rough Garment of outward rigour and formality, whereby they cheat the simple. So that "this rough Garment to deceive," we bring ye once again, grave Sirs, into your own vestry; or with Zachary shall not think much to fit it to your own shoulders. To bestow ought in good earnest on the magistrate, we know your classic priesthood is too gripple, for ye are always begging: and for this rough gown to deceive, we are confident ye cannot spare it; it is your Sunday's gown, your every day gown, your only gown, the gown of your faculty; your divining gown; to take it from ye were sacrilege. Wear it therefore, and possess it yourselves, most grave and reverend Carmelites, that all men both young and old, as we hope they will shortly, may yet better know ye, and distinguish ye by it; and give to your rough gown, where-ever they meet it, whether in pulpit, classis, or provincial synod, the precedency and the pre-eminence of deceiving.

They charge us next that we have broken the covenant, and loaden it with slighting reproaches. For the reproaching, let them answer that are guilty, whereof the state we are sure cannot be accused. For the breaking, let us hear wherein. "In labouring," say they, "to establish by law a universal toleration of all religions." This touches not the state; for certainly were they so minded, they need not labour it, but do it, having power in their hands; and we know of no act as yet passed to that purpose. But suppose it done, wherein is the covenant broke? The covenant enjoins us to endeavour the extirpation first of popery and prelacy, then of heresy, schism, and prophaneness, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness. And this we cease not to do by all effectual and proper means: But these divines might know that to extirpate all these things can be no work of the civil sword, but of the spiritual, which is the word of God.

No man well in his wits, endeavouring to root up weeds out of his ground, instead of using the spade will take a mallet or a beetle. Nor doth the covenant any way engage us to extirpate, or to prosecute the men, but the heresies and errors in them, which we tell these divines and the rest that understand not, belongs chiefly to their own function, in the diligent preaching and insisting upon sound doctrine, in the confuting, not the railing down errors, encountering both in public and private conference, and by the power of truth not of persecution, subduing those authors of heretical opinions, and lastly in the spiritual execution of Church-discipline within their own congregations. In all these way

ways we shall assist them, favour them, and as far as appertains to us join with them, and moreover not tolerate the free exercise of any religion, which shall be found absolutely contrary to sound doctrine or the power of godliness; for the conscience, we must have patience till it be within our verge. And thus doing, we shall believe to have kept exactly all that is required from us by the Covenant. Whilst they by their seditious practices against us, than which nothing for the present can add more assistance or advantage to those bloody rebels and papists in the south, will be found most pernicious covenant-breakers themselves, and as deep in that guilt as those of their own nation the last year; the warning of whose ill success like men hardened for the same judgment, they miserably pervert to an encouragement in the same offence, if not a far worse: For now they have joined interest with the Irish Rebels, who have ever fought against the Covenant, whereas their countrymen the year before made the covenant their plea. But as it is a peculiar mercy of God to his people, while they remain his, to preserve them from wicked confederations: so it is a mark and punishment of Hypocrites, to be driven at length to mix their cause, and the interest of their Covenant with God's enemies.

And whereas they affirm, that the tolerating of all religions in the manner that we tolerate them, is an innovation; we must acquaint them that we are able to make it good, if need be, both by Scripture and the primitive Fathers, and the frequent assertion of whole Churches and protestant states in their remonstrances and expostulations against the popish tyranny over souls. And what force of argument do these doctors bring to the contrary? But we have long observed to what pass the bold ignorance and sloth of our clergy tends no less now than in the bishops days, to make their bare sayings and censures authentic with the people, though destitute of any proof or argument. But thanks be to God, they are discerned!

Their next impeachment is, "that we oppose the presbyterial government, the hedge and bulwark of religion." Which all the land knows to be a most impudent falsehood, having established it with all freedom, wherever it hath been desired. Nevertheless, as we perceive it aspiring to be a compulsive power upon all without exception in parochial, classical, and provincial hierarchies, or to require the fleshly arm of magistracy in the execution of a spiritual discipline, to punish and amerce by any corporal infliction those whose consciences cannot be edified by what authority they are compelled, we hold it no more to be "the hedge and bulwark of religion," than the popish or prelatical courts, or the Spanish Inquisition.

But we are told, "we embrace paganism and judaism in the arms of toleration. A most audacious calumny! And yet while we detest Judaism, we know ourselves commanded by St. Paul, Rom. xi. to respect the Jews, and by all means to endeavour their conversion.

Neither was it ever sworn in the Covenant, to maintain a universal presbytery in England, as they falsely alledge, but in Scotland against the common enemy, if our aid were called for: being left free to reform our own country according to the word of God, and the example of best reformed churches; from which rule we are not yet departed.

But here, utterly forgetting to be ministers of the gospel, they presume to open their mouths not "in the spirit of meekness," as like dissemblers they pretend, but with as much devilish malice, impudence and falsehood, as any Irish rebel could have uttered; and from a barbarous nook of Ireland brand us with the extirpation of laws and liberties; things which they seem as little to understand as aught that belongs to good letters or humanity.

"That we seized on the person of the king;" who was surrendered into our hands an enemy and captive by our own subordinate and paid army of Scots in England. Next, "our imprisoning many members of the house." As if it were impossible they should deserve it, conspiring and bandying against the public good; which to the other part appearing, and, with the power they had, not resisting, had been a manifest desertion of
their

their trust and duty. No question but it is as good and necessary to expel rotten members out of the house, as to banish delinquents out of the land : and the reason holds as well in forty as in five. And if they be yet more, the more dangerous is their number. They had no privilege to sit there, and vote home the author, the impenitent author of all our miseries to freedom, honour and royalty, for a few fraudulent, if not destructive concessions. Which that they went about to do, how much more clear it was to all men, so much the more expedient, and important to the commonwealth was their speedy seizure and exclusion ; and no breach of any just privilege, but a breach of their knotted faction. And here they cry out, " an action without parallel in any age." So heartily we wish all men were unprejudiced in all our actions, as these illiterate denouncers never paralleled so much of any age as would contribute to the tithe of a century. " That we abolish parliamentary power, and establish a representative instead thereof." Now we have the height of them ; these profound instructors, in the midst of their representation, would know the English of a representative, and were perhaps of that classis, who heretofore were as much staggered at Triennial.

Their grand accusation is our justice done on the king, which that they may prove to be " without rule or example," they venture all the credit they have in divine and human history ; and by the same desperate boldness detect themselves to be egregious liars and impostors, seeking to abuse the multitude with a show of that gravity and learning which never was their portion. Had their knowledge been equal to the knowledge of any stupid monk, or abbot, they would have known at least, though ignorant of all things else, the life and acts of him, who first instituted their order : But these blockish presbyters of Clandeboy know not that John Knox, who was the first founder of presbytery in Scotland, taught professedly the doctrine of deposing, and of killing kings. And thus while they deny that any such rule can be found, the rule is found in their own country, given them by their own first presbyterian institutor ; and they themselves, like irregular friars walking contrary to the rule of their own foundation, deserve for so gross an ignorance and transgression to be disciplined upon their own stools. Or had their reading in history been any, which by this we may be confident is none at all, or their malice not heightened to a blind rage, they never would so rashly have thrown the dice to a palpable discovery of their ignorance and want of shame. But wherefore spend we two such precious things as time and reason upon priests, the most prodigal mis-spenders of time, and the scarcest owners of reason ? It is sufficient we have published our defences, given reasons, given examples of our justice done ; books also have been written to the same purpose for men to look on that will ; that no nation under heaven but in one age or other hath done the like. The difference only is, which rather seems to us matter of glory, that they for the most part have without form of law done the deed by a kind of martial justice, we by the deliberate and well-weighed sentence of a legal judicature.

But they tell us, " it was against the interest and protestation of the kingdom of Scotland." And did exceeding well to join those two together : hereby informing us what credit or regard need be given in England to a Scots protestation, ushered in by a Scots interest : certainly no more than we see is given in Scotland to an English declaration, declaring the interest of England. If then our interest move not them, why should theirs move us ? If they say, we are not all England ; we reply, they are not all Scotland : nay, were the last year so inconsiderable a part of Scotland as were beholden to this which they now term the sectarian army, to defend and rescue them at the charges of England from a stronger party of their own countrymen, in whose esteem they were no better than sectarians themselves. But they add, " it was against the former declarations of both kingdoms," to seize, or proceed against the king. We are certain that no such declarations of both kingdoms, as derive not their full force from the sense and meaning of the covenant, can be produced.

And if they plead against the covenant, "to preserve and defend his person;" we ask them briefly whether they take the covenant to be absolute or conditional? If absolute, then suppose the king to have committed all prodigious crimes and impieties against God, or nature, or whole nations, he must nevertheless be sacred from all violent touch. Which absurd opinion, how it can live in any man's reason, either natural or rectified, we much marvel: Since God declared his anger as impetuous for the saving of king Benhadad, though surrendering himself at mercy, as for the killing of Naboth. If it be conditional, in the preservation and defence of religion, and the people's liberty, then certainly to take away his life, being dangerous, and pernicious to both these, was no more a breach of the covenant, than for the same reason at Edinburgh to behead Gordon the marquess of Huntley. By the same covenant we made vow to assist and defend all those that should enter with us into this league; not absolutely, but in the maintenance and pursuing thereof. If therefore no man else ever was so mad as to claim from hence an impunity from all justice, why should any for the king, whose life by other articles of the same covenant, was forfeit? Nay if common sense had not led us to such a clear interpretation, the Scots commissioners themselves might boast to have been our first teachers: who when they drew to the malignance which brought forth that perfidious last year's irruption against all the bands of covenant or christian neighbourhood, making their hollow plea the defence of his majesty's person, they were constrained by their own guiltiness to leave out that following morsel that would have choaked them, "the preservation and defence of true religion, and our liberties." And questionless in the preservation of these, we are bound as well, both by the covenant, and before the covenant, to preserve and defend the person of any private man, as the person and authority of any inferior magistrate: So that this article, objected with such vehemence against us, contains not an exception of the king's person, and authority, to do by privilege what wickedness he list, and be defended, as some fancy, but an express testification of our loyalty; and the plain words without wresting will bear as much, that we had no thoughts against his person, or just power, provided they might consist with the preservation and defence of true religion and our liberties. But to these how hazardous his life was, will be needless to repeat so often. It may suffice that while he was in custody, where we expected his repentance, his remorse at last, and compassion of all the innocent blood shed already, and hereafter likely to be shed for his mere wilfulness, he made no other use of our continual forbearance, our humblest petitions and obtestations at his feet, but to sit contriving and fomenting new plots against us, and as his own phrase was, "playing his own game" upon the miseries of his people: Of which we desire no other view at present than these articles of peace with the rebels, and the rare game likely to ensue from such a cast of his cards. And then let men reflect a little upon the slanders and reviles of these wretched priests, and judge what modesty, what truth, what conscience, what any thing fit for ministers, or we might say reasonable men, can harbour in them. For what they began in shamelessness and malice, they conclude in frenzy: throwing out a sudden rhapsody of proverbs quite from the purpose; and with as much comeliness as when Saul prophesied. For casting off, as he did his garments, all modesty and meekness wherewith the language of ministers ought to be clothed, especially to their supreme magistrate, they talk at random of "servants raging, servants riding, and wonder how the earth can bear them." Either these men imagine themselves to be marvelously high set and exalted in the chair of Belfast, to vouchsafe the parliament of England no better stile than Servants, or else their high notion, which we rather believe, falls as low as court-parasitism; supposing all men to be servants, but the king. And then all their pains taken to seem so wise in proverbial, serve but to conclude them downright slaves: and the edge of their own proverb falls reverse upon themselves. For as "delight is not seemly for fools," much less high words to come from base minds. What they are for ministers, or how they crept into the fold, whether at the window, or through the wall, or who set them there so haughty in the pontifical

pontifical See of Belfast, we know not. But this we rather have cause to wonder, if the earth can bear this insufferable insolency of upstarts; who from a ground which is not their own, dare send such defiance to the sovereign magistracy of England, by whose authority and in whose right they inhabit there. By their actions we might rather judge them to be a generation of high-land thieves and red-shanks, who being neighbourly admitted, not as the Saxons by merit of their warfare against our enemies, but by the courtesy of England to hold possessions in our province, a country better than their own, have, with worse faith than those heathen, proved ingrateful and treacherous guests to their best friends and entertainers. And let them take heed, lest while their silence, as to these matters, might have kept them blameless and secure under those proceedings, which they so feared to partake in, that these their treasonous attempts and practices have not involved them in a far worse guilt of rebellion; and (notwithstanding that fair dehortatory from joining with malignants) in the appearance of a co-interest and partaking with the Irish rebels: Against whom, though by themselves pronounced to be the enemies of God, they go not out to battle, as they ought, but rather by these their doings assist and become associates!

ΕΙΚΟΝΟΚΛΑΣΤΗΣ.

In Answer to a Book Intituled,

ΕΙΚΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ,

The PORTRAITURE of his SACRED MAJESTY in
his Solitudes and Sufferings.

Prov. xxviii. 15. As a roaring lion and a ranging bear, so is a wicked ruler over the poor people.

16. The prince that wanteth understanding, is also a great oppressor ; but he that hateth covetousness, shall prolong his days.

17. A man that doth violence to the blood of any person, shall fly to the pit, let no man stay him.

Salust. Conjurat. Catalin.

Regium imperium, quod initio, conservandæ libertatis, atque augendæ reipub. causâ fuerat, in superbiam, dominationemque se convertit.

Regibus boni, quam mali, suspectiores sunt, semperque his aliena virtus formidolosa est.

Quidlibet impunè facere, hoc scilicet regium est.

Published by AUTHORITY.

The PREFACE.

TO descant on the misfortunes of a person falling from so high a dignity, who hath also paid his final debt both to nature and his faults, is neither of itself a thing commendable, nor the intention of this discourse : Neither was it fond ambition, or the vanity to get a name present or with posterity, by writing against a king. I never was so thirsty after fame, nor so destitute of other hopes and means, better and more certain to attain it : for kings have gained glorious titles from their favourers by writing against private men, as Henry the VIIIth did against Luther ; but no man ever gained much honour by writing against a king, as not usually meeting with that force of argument in such courtly antagonists, which to convince might add to his reputation. Kings most commonly, though strong in legions, are but weak at arguments ; as they who ever have accustomed from the cradle to use their will only as their right hand, their reason always as their left. Whence unexpectedly constrained to that kind of combat, they prove but weak and puny adversaries : Nevertheless, for their sakes who through custom, simplicity, or want of better teaching,

ing, have not more seriously considered kings, than in the gaudy name of majesty, and admire them and their doings as if they breathed not the same breath with other mortal men, I shall make no scruple to take up (for it seems to be the challenge both of him and all his party) to take up this gauntlet, though a king's, in the behalf of liberty and the commonwealth.

And further, since it appears manifestly the cunning drift of a factious and defeated party, to make the same advantage of his book, which they did before of his regal name and authority, and intend it not so much the defence of his former actions, as the promoting of their own future designs; (making thereby the book their own rather than the king's, as the benefit now must be their own more than his :) now the third time to corrupt and disorder the minds of weaker men, by new suggestions and narrations, either falsely or fallaciously representing the state of things to the dishonour of this present government, and the retarding of a general peace, so needful to this afflicted nation, and so nigh obtained; I suppose it no injury to the dead, but a good deed rather to the living, if by better information given them, or which is enough, by only remembering them the truth of what they themselves know to be here misaffirmed, they may be kept from entering the third time unadvisedly into war and bloodshed: for as to any moment of solidity in the book itself, stult with naught else but the common grounds of tyranny and popery, sugared a little over; or any need of answering, in respect of staid and well-principled men, I take it on me as a work assigned rather, than by me chosen or affected; which was the cause both of beginning it so late, and finishing it so leisurely in the midst of other employments and diversions. And if the late king had thought sufficient those answers and defences made for him in his life-time, they who on the other side accused his evil government, judging that on their behalf enough also hath been replied, the heat of this controversy was in likelihood drawing to an end; and the further mention of his deeds, not so much unfortunate as faulty, had in tenderness to his late sufferings been willingly forborn; and perhaps for the present age might have slept with him unrepeated, while his adversaries, calmed and assuaged with the success of their cause, had been the less unfavourable to his memory. But since he himself, making new appeal to truth and the world, hath left behind him this book, as the best advocate and interpreter of his own actions, and that his friends by publishing, dispersing, commending, and almost adoring it, seem to place therein the chief strength and nerves of their cause; it would argue doubtless in the other party great deficiency and distrust of themselves, not to meet the force of his reason in any field whatsoever, the force and equipage of whose arms they have so often met victoriously. And he who at the bar stood excepting against the form and manner of his judicature, and complained that he was not heard; neither he nor his friends shall have that cause now to find fault; being met and debated with in this open and monumental court of his own erecting; and not only heard uttering his whole mind at large, but answered: which to do effectually, if it be necessary that to his book nothing the more respect be had for being his, they of his own party can have no just reason to exclaim. For it were too unreasonable that he, because dead, should have the liberty in his book to speak all evil of the parliament; and they, because living, should be expected to have less freedom, or any for them, to speak home the plain truth of a full and pertinent reply: As he, to acquit himself, hath not spared his adversaries to load them with all sorts of blame and accusation, so to him, as in his book alive, there will be used no more courtship than he uses; but what is properly his own guilt, not imputed any more to his evil counsellors (a ceremony used longer by the parliament than he himself desired) shall be laid here, without circumlocutions, at his own door. That they who from the first beginning, or but now of late, by what unhappiness I know not, are so much affatuated, not with his person only, but with his palpable faults, and doat upon his deformities, may have none to blame but their own folly, if they live and die in such a strooken blindness, as next to that of Sodom hath not happened to any sort of men more gross or more misleading.

First

First then, that some men (whether this were by him intended or by his friends) have by policy accomplished after death that revenge upon their enemies which in life they were not able, hath been oft related. And among other examples we find that the last will of Cæsar being read to the people, and what bounteous legacies he had bequeathed them, wrought more in that vulgar audience to the avenging of his death, than all the art he could ever use to win his favour in his life-time. And how much their intent, who published these over-late apologies and meditations of the dead king, drives to the same end of stirring up the people to bring him that honour, that affection, and by consequence that revenge to his dead corpse, which he himself living could never gain to his person, it appears both by the conceited portraiture before his book, drawn out to the full measure of a masking scene, and set there to catch fools and silly gazers; and by those Latin words after the end, *Vota dabunt quæ bella negarunt*; intimating, that what he could not compass by war, he should atchieve by his meditations: for in words, which admit of various sense, the liberty is ours to chuse that interpretation which may best mind us of what our restless enemies endeavour, and what we are timely to prevent. And here may be well observed the loose and negligent curiosity of those who took upon them to adorn the setting out of this book; for though the picture set in front would martyr him and saint him to befool the people, yet the Latin motto in the end, which they understand not, leaves him, as it were, a politic contriver to bring about that interest by fair and plausible words, which the force of arms denied him. But quaint emblems and devices begged from the old pageantry of some twelfth-nights entertainment at Whitehall, will do but ill to make a saint or martyr: and if the people resolve to take him sainted at the rate of such a canonizing, I shall suspect their calendar more than the Gregorian. In one thing I must commend his openness who gave the title to this book, *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*, that is to say, The King's Image; and by the shrine he dresses out for him, certainly would have the people come and worship him. For which reason this answer also is intitled, *Iconoclastes*, the famous surname of many greek emperors, who in their zeal to the command of God, after long tradition of idolatry in the church, took courage and broke all superstitious images to pieces. But the people, exorbitant and excessive in all their motions, are prone oft-times not to a religious only, but to a civil kind of idolatry in idolizing their kings: though never more mistaken in the object of their worship; heretofore being wont to repute for saints those faithful and courageous barons who lost their lives in the field, making glorious war against tyrants for the common liberty; as Simon de Momfort, Earl of Leicester, against Henry the III^d; Thomas Plantagenet Earl of Lancaster, against Edward the II^d. But now with a besotted and degenerate baseness of spirit, except some few who yet retain in them the old English fortitude and love of freedom, and have testified it by their matchless deeds, the rest embastardized from the ancient nobleness of their ancestors, are ready to fall flat and give adoration to the image and memory of this man, who hath offered at more cunning fetches to undermine our liberties, and put tyranny into an art, than any British king before him: which low dejection and debasement of mind in the people, I must confess I cannot willingly ascribe to the natural disposition of an Englishman, but rather to two other causes: first, to the prelates and their fellow-teachers, though of another name and sect, whose pulpit-stuff, both first and last, hath been the doctrine and perpetual infusion of servility and wretchedness to all their hearers, and their lives the type of worldliness and hypocrisy, without the least true pattern of virtue, righteousness, or self-denial in their whole practice. I attribute it next to the factious inclination of most men divided from the public by several ends and humours of their own. At first no man less beloved, no man more generally condemned than was the king; from the time that it became his custom to break parliaments at home, and either wilfully or weakly to betray protestants abroad, to the beginning of these combustions. All men inveighed against him; all men, except court-vassals, opposed him and his tyrannical proceedings; the cry was universal; and

this full parliament was at first unanimous in their dislike and protestation against his evil government. But when they who fought themselves and not the public, began to doubt that all of them could not by one and the same way attain to their ambitious purposes, then was the king, or his name at least, as a fit property first made use of, his doing made the best of, and by degrees justified: which begot him such a party as after many wiles and strugglings with his inward fears, emboldened him at length to set up his standard against the parliament: Whenas before that time, all his adherents, consisting most of dissolute swordsmen and suburb-roysters, hardly amounted to the making up of one ragged regiment, strong-enough to assault the unarmed house of commons. After which attempt, seconded by a tedious and bloody war on his subjects, wherein he hath so far exceeded those his arbitrary violences in time of peace, they who before hated him for his high misgovernment, nay fought against him with displayed banners in the field, now applaud him and extol him for the wisest and most religious prince that lived. By so strange a method amongst the mad multitude is a sudden reputation won, of wisdom by wilfulness and subtile shifts, of goodness by multiplying evil, of piety by endeavouring to root out true religion.

But it is evident that the chief of his adherents never loved him, never honoured either him or his cause, but as they took him to set a face upon their own malignant designs; nor bemoan his loss at all, but the loss of their own aspiring hopes: like those captive women, whom the poet notes in his Iliad, to have bewailed the death of Patroclus in outward show, but indeed their own condition;

Πάτροκλον προφασιν, σφῶν δ' αὐτῶν κήδε ἐκάσῃ.

Hom. Iliad. τ.

And it needs must be ridiculous to any judgment uninthrall'd, that they who in other matters express so little fear either of God or man, should in this one particular outstrip all precisianism with their scruples and cases, and fill men's ears continually with the noise of their conscientious loyalty and allegiance to the king, rebels in the mean while to God in all their actions beside: much less that they whose professed loyalty and allegiance led them to direct arms against the king's person, and thought him nothing violated by the sword of hostility drawn by them against him, should now in earnest think him violated by the unsparing sword of justice, which undoubtedly so much the less in vain she bears among men, by how much greater and in highest place the offender. Else justice, whether moral or political, were not justice, but a false counterfeit of that impartial and godlike virtue. The only grief is, that the head was not strook off to the best advantage and commodity of them that held it by the hair: which observation, though made by a common enemy, may for the truth of it hereafter become a proverb. But as to the author of these soliloquies, whether it were the late king, as is vulgarly believed, or any secret Coadjutor, and some stick not to name him; it can add nothing, nor shall take from the weight, if any be, of reason which he brings. But allegations, not reasons, are the main contents of this book, and need no more than other contrary allegations to lay the question before all men in an even balance; though it were supposed that the testimony of one man in his own cause affirming, could be of any moment to bring in doubt the authority of a parliament denying. But if these his fair-spoken words shall be here fairly confronted and laid parallel to his own far differing deeds, manifest and visible to the whole nation, then surely we may look on them who notwithstanding shall persist to give to bare words more credit than to open deeds, as men whose judgment was not rationally evinced and persuaded, but fatally stupified and bewitched into such a blind and obstinate belief: for whose cure it may be doubted, not whether any charm, though never so wisely murmured, but whether any prayer can be available.

Upon

I. Upon the king's calling this last parliament.

THAT which the king lays down here as his first foundation, and as it were the head stone of the whole structure, that "He called this last parliament, not more by others advice, and the necessity of his affairs, than by his own choice and inclination;" is to all knowing men so apparently not true, that a more unlucky and inauspicious sentence, and more betokening the downfall of his whole fabric, hardly could have come into his mind. For who knows not that the inclination of a prince is best known either by those next about him, and most in favour with him, or by the current of his own actions? Those nearest to this king, and most his favourites, were courtiers and prelates; men whose chief study was to find out which way the king inclined, and to imitate him exactly: How these men stood affected to parliaments, cannot be forgotten. No man but may remember it was their continual exercise to dispute and preach against them; and in their common discourse nothing was more frequent, than that "they hoped the king should have now no need of parliaments any more." And this was but the copy which his parasites had industriously taken from his own words and actions, who never called a parliament, but to supply his necessities; and having supplied those, as suddenly and ignominiously dissolved it, without redressing any one grievance of the people: Sometimes choosing rather to miss of his subsidies, or to raise them by illegal courses, than that the people should not still miss of their hopes to be relieved by parliaments.

The first he broke off at his coming to the crown, for no other cause than to protect the duke of Buckingham against them who had accused him, besides other heinous crimes, of no less than poisoning the deceased king his father. And still the latter breaking was with more affront and indignity put upon the house and her worthiest members, than the former. Insomuch that in the fifth year of his reign, in a proclamation he seems offended at the very rumour of a parliament divulged among the people, as if he had taken it for a kind of slander, that men should think him that way exorable, much less inclined: and forbids it as a presumption to prescribe him any time for parliaments; that is to say, either by persuasion or petition, or so much as the reporting of such a rumour: for other manner of prescribing was at that time not suspected. By which fierce edict, the people, forbidden to complain, as well as forced to suffer, began from thenceforth to despair of parliaments. Whereupon such illegal actions, and especially to get vast sums of money, were put in practice by the king and his new officers, as monopolies, compulsive knight-hoods, coat, conduct and ship-money, the seizing not of one Naboth's vineyard, but of whole inheritances under the pretence of forrest, or crown-lands; corruption and bribery compounded for, with impunities granted for the future, as gave evident proof that the king never meant, nor could it stand with the reason of his affairs ever to recall parliaments: having brought by these irregular courses the people's interest and his own to so direct an opposition, that he might foresee plainly, if nothing but a parliament could save the people, it must necessarily be his undoing.

Till eight or nine years after, proceeding with a high hand in these enormities, and having the second time levied an injurious war against his native country, Scotland; and finding all those other shifts of raising money, which bore out his first expedition, now to fail him, not of his own choice and inclination, as any child may see, but urged by strong necessities, and the very pangs of state, which his own violent proceedings had brought him to, he calls a parliament; first in Ireland, which only was to give him four subsidies, and so to expire; then in England, where his first demand was but twelve subsidies, to maintain a Scots war, condemned and abominated by the whole kingdom: promising their grievances should be considered afterwards. Which when the parliament, who judged that war it self one of their main grievances, made no haste to grant, not
enduring

enduring the delay of his impatient will, or else fearing the conditions of their grant, he breaks off the whole session, and dismisses them and their grievances with scorn and frustration.

Much less therefore did he call this last parliament by his own choice and inclination; but having first tried in vain all undue ways to procure money, his army of their own accord being beaten in the north, the lords petitioning, and the general voice of the people almost hissing him and his ill-acted regality off the stage, compelled at length both by his wants, and by his fears, upon mere extremity he summoned this last parliament. And how is it possible that he should willingly incline to parliaments, who never was perceived to call them but for the greedy hope of a whole national bribe, his subsidies; and never loved, never fulfilled, never promoted the true end of parliaments, the redress of grievances; but still put them off, and prolonged them, whether gratified or not gratified; and was indeed the author of all those grievances? To say therefore that he called this parliament of his own choice and inclination, argues how little truth we can expect from the sequel of this book, which ventures in the very first period to affront more than one nation with an untruth so remarkable; and presumes a more implicit faith in the people of England, than the pope ever commanded from the Romish laity; or else a natural sottishness fit to be abused and ridden: While in the judgment of wise men, by laying the foundation of his defence on the avouchment of that which is so manifestly untrue, he hath given a worse foil to his own cause, than when his whole forces were at any time overthrown. They therefore who think such great service done to the king's affairs in publishing this book, will find themselves in the end mistaken; if sense and right mind, or but any mediocrity of knowledge and remembrance hath not quite forsaken men.

But to prove his inclination to parliaments, he affirms here, "to have always thought the right way of them most safe for his crown, and best pleasing to his people." What he thought we know not, but that he ever took the contrary way, we saw; and from his own actions we felt long ago what he thought of parliaments or of pleasing his people: a surer evidence than what we hear now too late in words.

He alledges, that "the cause of forbearing to convene parliaments was the sparks which some men's distempers there studied to kindle." They were indeed not tempered to his temper; for it neither was the law, nor the rule by which all other tempers were to be tried; but they were esteemed and chosen for the fittest men, in their several counties, to allay and quench those distempers which his own inordinate doings had inflamed. And if that were his refusing to convene, till those men had been qualified to his temper, that is to say, his will, we may easily conjecture what hope there was of parliaments, had not fear and his insatiate poverty, in the midst of his excessive wealth, constrained him.

"He hoped by his freedom and their moderation to prevent misunderstandings." And wherefore not by their freedom and his moderation? But freedom he thought too high a word for them, and moderation too mean a word for himself: this was not the way to prevent misunderstandings. He still "feared passion and prejudice in other men;" not in himself: "and doubted not by the weight of his "own" reason to counterpoise any faction;" it being so easy for him, and so frequent, to call his obstinacy reason, and other men's reason, faction. We in the mean while must believe, that wisdom and all reason came to him by title with his crown; passion, prejudice, and faction came to others by being subjects.

"He was sorry to hear with what popular heat elections were carried in many places." Sorry rather that court-letters and intimations prevailed no more, to divert, or to deter the people from their free election of those men, whom they thought best affected to religion and their country's liberty, both at that time in danger to be lost. And such men they were, as by the kingdom were sent to advise him, not sent to be cavilled at, because elected, or to be entertained by him with an undervalue and misprision of their temper, judgment, or affection. In vain was a parliament thought fittest by the known laws of
our

our nation, to advise and regulate unruly kings, if they, instead of hearkening to advice, should be permitted to turn it off, and refuse it by vilifying and traducing their advisers, nor by accusing of a popular heat those that lawfully elected them.

“His own and his children’s interest obliged him to seek, and to preserve the love and welfare of his subjects.” Who doubts it? But the same interest, common to all kings, was never yet available to make them all seek that, which was indeed best for themselves and their posterity. All men by their own and their children’s interest are obliged to honesty and justice: but how little that consideration works in private men, how much less in kings, their deeds declare best.

“He intended to oblige both friends and enemies, and to exceed their desires, did they but pretend to any modest and sober sense;” mistaking the whole business of a parliament; which met not to receive from him obligations, but justice; nor he to expect from them their modesty, but their grave advice, uttered with freedom in the public cause. His talk of modesty in their desires of the common welfare, argues him not much to have understood what he had to grant, who misconceived so much the nature of what they had to desire. And for sober sense, the expression was too mean, and recoils with as much dishonour upon himself, to be a king where sober sense could possibly be so wanting in a parliament.

“The odium and offences which some men’s rigour, or remissness in Church and state, had contracted upon his government, he resolved to have expiated with better laws and regulations.” And yet the worst of misdemeanors committed by the worst of all his favourites in the height of their dominion, whether acts of rigor or remissness, he hath from time to time continued, owned, and taken upon himself by public declarations, as often as the clergy, or any other of his instruments felt themselves overburdened with the people’s hatred. And who knows not the superstitious rigour of his Sunday’s chapel, and the licentious remissness of his Sunday’s theatre; accompanied with that reverend statute for Dominical jigs and maypoles, published in his own name, and derived from the example of his father James? Which testifies all that rigor in superstition, all that remissness in religion to have issued out originally from his own house, and from his own authority. Much rather then may those general miscarriages in state, his proper sphere, be imputed to no other person chiefly than to himself. And which of all those oppressive acts or impositions did he ever disclaim or disavow, till the fatal awe of this parliament hung omenously over him? Yet here he smoothly seeks to wipe off all the envy of his evil government upon his substitutes and under-officers; and promises, though much too late, what wonders he purposed to have done in the reforming of religion; a work wherein all his undertakings heretofore declare him to have had little or no judgment: Neither could his breeding, or his course of life acquaint him with a thing so spiritual. Which may well assure us what kind of reformation we could expect from him; either some politic form of an imposed religion, or else perpetual vexation and persecution to all those that complied not with such a form. The like amendment he promises in state; not a step further “than his reason and conscience told him was fit to be desired; wishing he had kept within those bounds, and not suffered his own judgment to have been over-born in some things,” of which things one was the Earl of Strafford’s execution. And what signifies all this, but that still his resolution was the same to set up an arbitrary government of his own, and that all Britain was to be tied and chained to the conscience, judgment, and reason of one man; as if those gifts had been only his peculiar and prerogative, intailed upon him with his fortune to be a king? Whenas doubtless no man so obstinate, or so much a tyrant, but professes to be guided by that which he calls his reason and his judgment, tho’ never so corrupted; and pretends also his conscience. In the mean while, for any parliament or the whole nation to have either reason, judgment, or conscience by this rule, was altogether in vain, if it thwarted the king’s will; which was easy for him
to

to call by any other plausible name. And thus we find these fair and specious promises, made upon the experience of many hard sufferings, and his most mortified retirements, being thoroughly sifted, to contain nothing in them much different from his former practices, so cross and so averse to all his parliaments, and both the nations of this island. What fruits they could in likelihood have produced in his reformation, is obvious to any prudent foresight.

And this is the substance of his first section, till we come to the devout of it, modelled into the form of a private psalter. Which they who so much admire the arch-bishop's late breviary, and many others, as good Manuals and Hand-maids of Devotion, the lip-work of every prelatical liturgist, clapt together, and quilted out of scripture-phrases, with as much ease, and as little need of christian diligence or judgment, as belongs to the compiling of any ordinary and saleable piece of English divinity that the shops value. But he who from such a kind of psalmistry, or any other verbal devotion, without the pledge and earnest of suitable deeds, can be persuaded of a zeal and true righteousness in the person, hath much yet to learn, and knows not that the deepest policy of a tyrant hath been ever to counterfeit religious. And Aristotle in his politics hath mentioned that special craft among twelve other tyrannical Sophisms. Neither want we examples: Andronicus Comnenus the Byzantine emperor, though a most cruel tyrant, is reported by Nicetas to have been a constant reader of Saint Paul's epistles; and by continual study had so incorporated the phrase and stile of that transcendent apostle into all his familiar letters, that the imitation seemed to vie with the original. Yet this availed not to deceive the people of that empire, who notwithstanding his saint's vizard, tore him to pieces for his tyranny. From stories of this nature both ancient and modern which abound, the poets also, and some English, have been in this point so mindful of Decorum, as to put never more pious words in the mouth of any person than of a tyrant. I shall not instance an abstruse author, wherein the king might be less conversant, but one whom we well know was the closet companion of these his solitudes, William Shakespeare, who introduces the person of Richard the Third, speaking in as high a strain of piety and mortification as is uttered in any passage of this book, and sometimes to the same sense and purpose with some words in this place; "I intended," saith he, "not only to oblige my friends, but my enemies." The like saith Richard, Act II. Scen. 1.

I do not know that Englishman alive,
With whom my soul is any jot at odds,
More than the infant that is born to night;
I thank my God for my humility.

Other stuff of this sort may be read throughout the whole tragedy, wherein the poet used not much licence in departing from the truth of history, which delivers him a deep dissembler, not of his affections only, but of religion.

In praying therefore, and in the outward work of devotion, this king we see hath not at all exceeded the worst of kings before him. But herein the worst of kings, professing Christianity, have by far exceeded him. They, for aught we know, have still prayed their own, or at least borrowed from fit authors. But this king, not content with that which, although in a thing holy, is no holy theft, to attribute to his own making other men's whole prayers, hath as it were unhallowed and unchristened the very duty of prayer itself, by borrowing to a christian use prayers offered to a heathen god. Who would have imagined so little fear in him of the true all-seeing deity, so little reverence of the Holy Ghost, whose office is to dictate and present our christian prayers, so little care of truth in his last words, or honour to himself, or to his friends, or sense of his afflictions, or of that sad hour which was upon him, as immediately before his death to pop into the hand of that grave
bishop

bishop who attended him; as a special relique of his faintly exercises, a Prayer stolen word for word from the mouth of a heathen woman praying to a heathen god; and that in no serious book, but in the vain amatorious poem of Sir Philip Sydney's *Arcadia*; a book in that kind full of worth and wit, but among religious thoughts and duties not worthy to be named; nor to be read at any time without good caution, much less in time of trouble and affliction to be a christian's prayer-book? It hardly can be thought upon without some laughter, that he who had acted over us so stately and so tragically, should leave the world at last with such a ridiculous exit, as to bequeath among his deifying friends that stood about him, such a piece of mockery to be published by them, as must needs cover both his and their heads with shame and confusion. And sure it was the hand of God that let them fall, and be taken in such a foolish trap, as hath exposed them to all derision, if for nothing else, to throw contempt and disgrace in the sight of all men, upon this his idolized book, and the whole rosary of his prayers; thereby testifying how little he accepted them from those who thought no better of the living God than of a buzzard idol, that would be served and worshipped with the polluted trash of romances and *Arcadias*, without discerning the affront so irreligiously and so boldly offered him to his face.

Thus much be said in general to his prayers, and in special to that Arcadian prayer used in his captivity; enough to undeceive us what esteem we are to set upon the rest.

And thus far in the whole chapter we have seen and considered, and it cannot but be clear to all men, how and for what ends, what concerns and necessities, the late king was no way induced, but every way constrained to call this last parliament; yet here in his first prayer he trembles not to avouch as in the ears of God, "That he did it with an upright intention to his glory, and his people's good:" of which dreadful attestation how sincerely meant, God, to whom it was avowed, can only judge; and he hath judged already, and hath written his impartial sentence in characters legible to all christendom; and besides hath taught us that there be some whom he hath given over to delusion, whose very mind and conscience is defiled, of whom St. Paul to Titus makes mention.

II. Upon the Earl of STRAFFORD's Death.

THIS next chapter is a penitent confession of the king, and the strangest, if it be well weighed, that ever was auricular. For he repents here of giving his consent, though most unwillingly, to the most seasonable and solemn piece of justice that had been done of many years in the land: but his sole conscience thought the contrary. And thus was the welfare, the safety, and within a little, the unanimous demand of three populous nations to have attended still on the singularity of one man's opinionated conscience; if men had always been so tame and spiritless, and had not unexpectedly found the grace to understand, that if his conscience were so narrow and peculiar to itself, it was not fit his authority should be so ample and universal over others: for certainly a private conscience forts not with a public calling, but declares that person rather meant by nature for a private fortune. And this also we may take for truth, that he whose conscience thinks it sin to put to death a capital offender, will as oft think it meritorious to kill a righteous person. But let us hear what the sin was that lay so sore upon him; and, as his prayer given to Dr. Juxon, testifies to the very day of his death, it was his signing the bill of Strafford's execution: a man whom all men looked upon as one of the boldest and most impetuous instruments that the king had to advance any violent or illegal design. He had ruled Ireland and some parts of England, in an arbitrary manner; had endeavoured to subvert fundamental laws, to subvert parliaments, and to incense the king against them; he had also endeavoured to make hostility between England and Scotland: he had counselled the

king to call over that Irish army of papists, which he had cunningly raised, to reduce England, as appeared by good testimony then present at the consultation: for which, and many other crimes alledged and proved against him in twenty-eight articles, he was condemned of high treason by the parliament. The commons by far the greater number cast him; the lords after they had been satisfied in a full discourse by the king's solicitor, and the opinions of many judges delivered in their house, agreed likewise to the sentence of treason. The people universally cried out for justice. None were his friends but courtiers and clergymen, the worst at that time, and most corrupted sort of men; and court-ladies, not the best of women; who when they grow to that insolence as to appear active in state-affairs, are the certain sign of a dissolute, degenerate, and pusillanimous commonwealth. Last of all the king, or rather first, for these were but his apes, was not satisfied in conscience to condemn him of high treason; and declared to both houses, "That no fears or respects whatsoever should make him alter that resolution founded upon his conscience:" either then his resolution was indeed not founded upon his conscience, or his conscience received better information, or else both his conscience and this his strong resolution strook fail, notwithstanding these glorious words, to his stronger fear; for within a few days after, when the judges at a privy council, and four of his elected bishops had picked the thorn out of his conscience, he was at length persuaded to sign the bill for Strafford's execution. And yet perhaps that it wrung his conscience to condemn the earl of high treason is not unlikely; not because he thought him guiltless of highest treason, had half those crimes been committed against his own private interest or person, as appeared plainly by his charge against the six members; but because he knew himself a principal in what the earl was but his accessory, and thought nothing treason against the commonwealth, but against himself only.

Had he really scrupled to sentence that for treason which he thought not treasonable, why did he seem resolved by the judges and the bishops? and if by them resolved, how comes the scruple here again? It was not then, as he now pretends, "The importunities of some, and the fear of many," which made him sign, but the satisfaction given him by those judges and ghostly fathers of his own chusing. Which of him shall we believe? for he seems not one, but double; either here we must not believe him professing that his satisfaction was but seemingly received and out of fear, or else we may as well believe that the scruple was no real scruple, as we can believe him here against himself before, that the satisfaction then received was no real satisfaction. Of such a variable and fleeting conscience, what hold can be taken? But that indeed it was a facile conscience, and could dissemble satisfaction when it pleased, his own ensuing actions declared; being soon after found to have the chief hand in a most detested conspiracy against the parliament and kingdom, as by letters and examinations of Percy, Goring, and other conspirators came to light, that his intention was to rescue the earl of Strafford, by seizing on the Tower of London; to bring up the English army out of the North, joined with eight thousand Irish papists raised by Strafford, and a French army to be landed at Portsmouth against the parliament and their friends. For which purpose the king, though requested by both houses to disband those Irish Papists, refused to do it, and kept them still in arms to his own purposes. No marvel then, if being as deeply criminous as the earl himself, it stung his conscience to adjudge to death those misdeeds whereof himself had been the chief author: no marvel though instead of blaming and detesting his ambition, his evil counsel, his violence and oppression of the people; he fall to praise his great Abilities, and with scholastic flourishes beneath the decency of a king, compares him to the Sun, which in all figurative use and significance bears allusion to a king, not to a subject: no marvel though he knit contradictions as close, as words can lie together, "not approving in his judgment," and yet approving in his subsequent reason all that Strafford did, as "driven by the necessity of times, and the temper of

of that people;" for this excuses all his misdemeanours: Lastly, no marvel that he goes on building many fair and pious conclusions upon false and wicked premises, which deceive the common reader, not well discerning the antipathy of such connexions: but this is the marvel, and may be the astonishment of all that have a conscience, how he durst in the sight of God (and with the same words of contrition wherewith David repents the murdering of Uriah) repent his lawful compliance to that just act of not saving him, whom he ought to have delivered up to speedy punishment, though himself the guiltier of the two. If the deed were so sinful to have put to death so great a malefactor, it would have taken much doubtless from the heaviness of his sin to have told God in his confession, how he laboured, what dark plots he had contrived, into what a league entred, and with what conspirators against his parliament and kingdoms, to have rescued from the claim of justice so notable and so dear an instrument of tyranny; which would have been a story, no doubt, as pleasing in the ears of Heaven, as all these equivocal repentances. For it was fear, and nothing else, which made him feign before both the scruple and the satisfaction of his conscience, that is to say, of his mind: his first fear pretended conscience, that he might be borne with to refuse signing, his latter fear being more urgent, made him find a conscience both to sign, and to be satisfied. As for repentance, it came not on him till a long time after; when he saw "he could have suffered nothing more, though he had denied that Bill." For how could he understandingly repent of letting that be treason, which the parliament and whole nation so judged? This was that which repented him, to have given up to just punishment so stout a champion of his designs, who might have been so useful to him in his following civil broils. It was a worldly repentance, not a conscientious; or else it was a strange tyranny which his conscience had got over him, to vex him like an evil spirit for doing one act of justice, and by that means to "fortify his resolution" from ever doing so any more. That mind must needs be irrecoverably depraved, which either by chance or importunity, tasting but once of one just deed, spatters at it, and abhors the relish ever after. To the scribes and pharisees, woe was denounced by our Saviour, for straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel, though a gnat were to be strained at: But to a conscience with whom one good deed is so hard to pass down as to endanger almost a choaking, and bad deeds without number, though as big and bulky as the ruin of three kingdoms, go down currently without straining, certainly a far greater woe appertains. If his conscience were come to that unnatural Dyscrasy, as to digest poison and to keck at wholesome food, it was not for the parliament, or any of his kingdoms to feed with him any longer. Which to conceal he would persuade us that the parliament also in their conscience escaped not "some touches of remorse" for putting Strafford to death, in forbidding it by an after-act to be a precedent for the future. But in a fairer construction, that act implied rather a desire in them to pacify the king's mind, whom they perceived by this means quite alienated; in the mean while not imagining that this after-act should be retorted on them to tie up justice for the time to come upon like occasion, whether this were made a precedent or not, no more than the want of such a precedent, if it had been wanting, had been available to hinder this.

But how likely is it that this after-act argued in the parliament their least repenting for the death of Strafford, when it argued so little in the king himself, who notwithstanding this after-act, which had his own hand and concurrence, if not his own instigation, within the same year accused of high treason no less than six members at once for the same pretended crimes which his conscience would not yield to think treasonable in the earl: So that this his subtle argument to fasten a repenting, and by that means a guiltiness of Strafford's death upon the parliament, concludes upon his own head; and shews us plainly that either nothing in his judgment was treason against the commonwealth, but only against the king's person; (a tyrannical principle!) or that his conscience was a perverse and prevaricating conscience, to scruple that the commonwealth should

punish for treasonous in one eminent offender, that which he himself sought so vehemently to have punished in six guiltless persons. If this were "that touch of conscience which he bore with greater regret" than for any other sin committed in his life, whether it were that proditory aid sent to Rochel and religion abroad, or that prodigality of shedding blood at home, to a million of his subjects lives not valued in comparison of one Strafford, we may consider yet at last what true sense and feeling could be in that conscience, and what fitness to be the master-conscience of three kingdoms.

But the reason why he labours that we should take notice of so much "tenderneſs and regret in his ſoul for having any hand in Strafford's death," is worth the marking e'er we conclude: "He hoped it would be ſome evidence before God and man to all poſterity, that he was far from bearing that vaſt load and guilt of blood" laid upon him by others: Which hath the likeness of a ſubtle diſſimulation, bewailing the blood of one man, his commodious instrument, put to death moſt juſtly, though by him unwillingly, that we might think him too tender to ſhed willingly the blood of thoſe thouſands, whom he counted rebels. And thus by dipping voluntarily his fingers end, yet with ſhew of great remorse, in the blood of Strafford, whereof all men clear him, he thinks to ſcape that ſea of innocent blood wherein his own guilt inevitably hath plunged him all over. And we may well perceive to what eaſy ſatisfactions and purgations he had inured his ſecret conscience, who thinks by ſuch weak policies and oſtentations as theſe, to gain belief and abſolution from underſtanding men.

III. Upon his going to the Houſe of Commons.

Concerning his unexcusable and hoſtile march from the court to the houſe of commons, there needs not much be ſaid; for he confeſſes it to be an act which moſt men whom he calls "his enemies" cried ſhame upon, "indifferent men grew jealous of and fearful, and many of his friends reſented, as a motion ariſing rather from paſſion than reaſon:" He himſelf, in one of his answers to both houſes, made profeſſion to be convinced that it was a plain breach of their privilege; yet here like a rotten building newly trimmed over, he repreſents it ſpeciouſly and fraudulently, to impoſe upon the ſimple reader; and ſeeks by ſmooth and ſupple words not here only, but through his whole book, to make ſome beneficial uſe or other even of his worſt miſcarriages.

Theſe men, ſaith me, meaning his friends, "knew not the juſt motives and pregnant grounds with which I thought myſelf furniſhed;" to wit, againſt the five members whom he came to drag out of the houſe. His beſt friends indeed knew not, nor could ever know his motives to ſuch a riotous act; and had he himſelf known any juſt grounds, he was not ignorant how much it might have tended to his juſtifying, had he named them in this place, and not concealed them. But ſuppoſe them real, ſuppoſe them known, what was this to that violation and diſhonour put upon the whole houſe, whoſe very door forcibly kept open, and all the paſſages near it beſet with ſwords and piſtols cockt and menaced in the hands of about three hundred ſwaggerers and ruffians, who but expected, nay audibly called for, the word of onſet to begin a ſlaughter?

"He had diſcovered, as he thought, unlawful correſpondencies which they had uſed, and engagements to embroil his kingdoms," and remembers not his own unlawful correſpondencies and conſpiracies with the Iriſh army of papiſts, with the French to land at Portſmouth, and his tampering both with the Engliſh and Scots army to come up againſt the parliament: the leaſt of which attempts by whomſoever, was no leſs than manifeſt treaſon againſt the commonwealth.

If to demand juſtice on the five members were his Plea, for that which they with more reaſon might have demanded juſtice upon him (I uſe his own argument) there needed not ſo rough aſſiſtance. If he had "reſolved to bear that repulſe with patience," which his queen by her words to him at his return little thought he would have done, where-

wherefore did he provide against it with such an armed and unusual force? but his heart served him not to undergo the hazard that such a desperate scuffle would have brought him to. But wherefore did he go at all, it behoving him to know there were two statutes that declared he ought first to have acquainted the parliament, who were the accusers, which he refused to do, though still professing to govern by law, and still justifying his attempts against law? And when he saw it was not permitted him to attain them but by a fair trial, as was offered him from time to time, for want of just matter which yet never came to light, he let the business fall of his own accord; and all those Pregnancies and just Motives came to just nothing.

“He had no temptation of displeasure or revenge against those men:” None but what he thirsted to execute upon them, for the constant opposition which they made against his tyrannous proceedings, and the love and reputation which they therefore had among the people.

“He mist but little to have produced writings under some men’s own hands.” But yet he mist, though their chambers, trunks, and studies were sealed up and searched; yet not found guilty. “Providence would not have it so.” Good Providence, that curbs the raging of proud monarchs, as well as of mad multitudes. “Yet he wanted not such probabilities” (for his pregnant is come now to probable) “as were sufficient to raise jealousies in any king’s heart:” And thus his pregnant motives are at last proved nothing but a tympany, or a queen Mary’s cushion; for in any king’s heart, as kings go now, what shadowy conceit or groundless toy will not create a jealousy?

“That he had designed to assault the house of commons,” taking God to witness, he utterly denies; yet in his answer to the city, maintains that “any course of violence had been very justifiable.” And we may then guess how far it was from his design: However, it discovered in him an excessive eagerness to be avenged on them that crossed him; and that to have his will, he stood not to do things never so much below him. What a becoming sight it was, to see the king of England one while in the house of commons, and by and by in the Guildhall among the liveries and manufactures, prosecuting so greedily the track of five or six fled subjects; himself not the solicitor only but the pursivant, and the apparitor of his own partial cause! And although in his answers to the parliament, he hath confessed, first that his manner of prosecution was illegal, next “that as he once conceived he had ground enough to accuse them, so at length that he found as good cause to desert any prosecution of them;” yet here he seems to reverse all, and against promise takes up his old deserted accusation, that he might have something to excuse himself, instead of giving due reparation, which he always refused to give them whom he had so dishonoured.

“That I went,” saith he of his going to the house of commons, “attended with some gentlemen;” Gentlemen indeed! the ragged infantry of stews, and brothels; the spawn and shipwreck of taverns and dicing-houses: and then he pleads, “it was no unwonted thing for the majesty and safety of a king to be so attended, especially in discontented times.” An illustrious majesty no doubt, so attended! a becoming safety for the king of England, placed in the fidelity of such guards and champions! happy times, when braves and hacksters, the only contented members of his government, were thought the fittest and the faithfullest to defend his person against the discontents of a parliament and all good men! Were those the chosen ones to “preserve reverence to him,” while he entered unassured, and full of suspicions, into his great and faithful counsel? Let God then and the world judge, whether the cause were not in his own guilty and unwarrantable doings: The house of commons upon several examinations of this business, declared it sufficiently proved that the coming of those soldiers, papists and others with the king, was to take away some of their members, and in case of opposition or denial, to have fallen upon the house in a hostile manner. This the king here denies; adding a fearful imprecation against his own life, “If he purposed any violence:

violence or oppression against the innocent, then," saith he, "let the enemy persecute my soul, and tread my life to the ground, and lay my honour in the dust." What need then more disputing? He appealed to God's tribunal, and behold God hath judged and done to him in the sight of all men according to the verdict of his own mouth: To be a warning to all kings hereafter, how they use presumptuously the words and protestations of David, without the spirit and conscience of David. And the king's admirers may here see their madness, to mistake this book for a monument of his worth and wisdom, whenas indeed it is his Doomsday-Book; not like that of William the Norman his Predecessor, but the record and memorial of his condemnation; and discovers whatever hath befallen him, to have been hastened on from divine justice by the rash and inconsiderate appeal of his own lips. But what evasions, what pretences, though never so unjust and empty, will he refuse in matters more unknown, and more involved in the mists and intricacies of state, who rather than not justify himself in a thing so generally odious, can flatter his integrity with such frivolous excuses against the manifest dissent of all men, whether enemies, neutrals, or friends. But God and his judgments have not been mocked; and good men may well perceive what a distance there was ever like to be between him and his parliament, and perhaps between him and all amendment, who for one good deed, though but consented to, asks God forgiveness; and from his worst deeds done, takes occasion to insist upon his righteousness.

IV. Upon the Insolency of the Tumults.

WE have here, I must confess, a neat and well-couched invective against tumults, expressing a true fear of them in the author; but yet so handsomely composed, and withal so feelingly, that, to make a royal comparison, I believe Rehoboam the son of Solomon, could not have composed it better. Yet Rehoboam had more cause to inveigh against them; for they had stoned his tribute-gatherer, and perhaps had as little spared his own person, had he not with all speed betaken him to his chariot. But this king hath stood the worst of them in his own house without danger, when his coach and horses, in a panic fear, have been to seek: which argues that the tumults at Whitehall, were nothing so dangerous as those at Sechem.

But the matter here considerable is not whether the king, or his household Rhetorician have made a pithy declamation against tumults, but first whether these were tumults or not; next if they were, whether the king himself did not cause them. Let us examine therefore how things at that time stood. The king, as before hath been proved, having both called this parliament unwillingly, and as unwillingly from time to time condescended to their several acts, carrying on a disjoint and private interest of his own, and not enduring to be so crossed and overswayed, especially in the executing of his chief and boldest instrument, the deputy of Ireland, first tempts the English army, with no less reward than the spoil of London, to come up and destroy the parliament. That being discovered by some of the officers, who, though bad enough, yet abhorred so foul a deed, the king hardened in his purpose, turns him next to the Scotch army, and baits his temptation with a richer reward; not only to have the sacking of London, but four Northern counties to be made Scottish, with jewels of great value to be given in pawn the while. But neither would the Scots, for any promise of reward, be bought to such an execrable and odious treachery; but with much honesty gave notice of the king's design both to the parliament and city of London. The parliament moreover had intelligence, and the people could not but discern that there was a bitter and malignant party grown up now to such a boldness, as to give out insolent and threatening speeches against the parliament itself. Besides this, the rebellion in Ireland was now broke out; and a conspiracy in Scotland had been made, while the king was there, against some chief members

members of that parliament; great numbers here of unknown and suspicious persons resorted to the city. The king being returned from Scotland, presently dismisses that guard which the parliament thought necessary in the midst of so many dangers to have about them, and puts another guard in their place, contrary to the privilege of that high court, and by such a one commanded, as made them no less doubtful of the guard itself. Which they therefore, upon some ill effects thereof first found, discharge; deeming it more safe to sit free, though without a guard, in open danger, than inclosed with a suspected safety. The people therefore, lest their worthiest and most faithful patriots, who had exposed themselves for the public, and whom they saw now left naked, should want aid, or be deserted in the midst of these dangers, came in multitudes, though unarmed, to witness their fidelity and readiness in case of any violence offered to the parliament. The king both envying to see the people's love thus devolved on another object, and doubting lest it might utterly disable him to do with parliaments, as he was wont, sent a message into the city forbidding such resorts. The parliament also, both by what was discovered to them, and what they saw in a malignant party (some of which had already drawn blood in a fray or two at the court-gate, and even at their own gate in Westminster-hall) conceiving themselves to be still in danger where they sat, sent a most reasonable and just petition to the king, that a guard might be allowed them out of the city, whereof the king's own Chamberlain, the earl of Essex, might have command; it being the right of inferior courts to make choice of their own guard. This the king refused to do, and why he refused, the very next day made manifest: For on that day it was, that he sallied out from Whitehall, with those trusty Myrmidons, to block up, or give assault to the house of commons. He had, besides all this, begun to fortify his court, and entertained armed men not a few; who standing at his palace-gate, reviled, and with drawn swords wounded many of the people, as they went by unarmed, and in a peaceable manner, whereof some died. The passing by of a multitude, though neither to St. George's feast, nor to a tilting, certainly of itself was no tumult; the expression of their loyalty and steadfastness to the parliament, whose lives and safeties by more than slight rumours they doubted to be in danger, was no tumult. If it grew to be so, the cause was in the king himself and his injurious retinue, who both by hostile preparations in the court, and by actual assailing of the people, gave them just cause to defend themselves.

Surely those unarmed and petitioning people, needed not have been so formidable to any, but to such whose consciences misgave them how ill they had deserved of the people; and first began to injure them, because they justly feared it from them; and then ascribe that to popular tumult, which was occasioned by their own provoking.

And that the king was so emphatical and elaborate on this theme against tumults, and expressed with such a vehemence his hatred of them, will redound less perhaps than he was aware to the commendation of his government. For besides that in good governments they happen seldomest, and rise not without cause, if they prove extreme and pernicious, they were never counted so to monarchy, but to monarchical tyranny; and extremes one with another are at most antipathy. If then the king so extremely stood in fear of tumults, the inference will endanger him to be the other extreme. Thus far the occasion of this discourse against tumults: now to the discourse itself, voluble enough, and full of sentence, but that, for the most part, either specious rather than solid, or to his cause nothing pertinent.

"He never thought any thing more to presage the mischiefs that ensued, than those tumults." Then was his foresight but short, and much mistaken. Those tumults were but the mild effects of an evil and injurious reign; not signs of mischiefs to come, but seeking relief for mischiefs past: those signs were to be read more apparent in his rage
and

and purposed revenge of those free expostulations, and clamours of the people against his lawless government. "Not any thing," saith he, "portends more God's displeasure against a nation, than when he suffers the clamours of the vulgar to pass all bounds of law and reverence to authority." It portends rather his displeasure against a tyrannous king, whose proud throne he intends to overturn by that contemptible vulgar; the sad cries and oppressions of whom his royalty regarded not. As for that supplicating people, they did no hurt either to law or authority, but stood for it rather in the parliament against whom they feared would violate it.

"That they invaded the honour and freedom of the two houses," is his own officious accusation, not seconded by the parliament, who had they seen cause, were themselves best able to complain. And if they "shook and menaced" any, they were such as had more relation to the court than to the commonwealth; enemies, not patrons of the people. But if their petitioning unarmed were an invasion of both houses, what was his entrance into the house of commons, besetting it with armed men? In what condition then was the honour and freedom of that house?

"They forbore not rude deportments, contemptuous words and actions to himself and his court."

It was more wonder, having heard what treacherous hostility he had designed against the city and his whole kingdom, that they forebore to handle him as people in their rage have handled tyrants heretofore for less offences.

"They were not a short ague, but a fierce quotidian fever." He indeed may best say it, who most felt it; for the shaking was within him, and it shook him by his own description "worse than a storm, worse than an earthquake;" Belshazzar's palsy. Had not worse fears, terrors, and envies made within him that commotion, how could a multitude of his subjects, armed with no other weapon than petitions, have shaken all his joints with such a terrible ague? Yet that the parliament should entertain the least fear of bad intentions from him or his party, he endures not; but would persuade us that "men scare themselves and others without cause:" for he thought fear would be to them a kind of armour, and his design was, if possible, to disarm all, especially of a wise fear and suspicion; for that he knew would find weapons.

He goes on therefore with vehemence to repeat the mischiefs done by these tumults. "They first petitioned, then protected; dictate next, and lastly over-awe the parliament. They removed obstructions, they purged the houses, cast out rotten members." If there were a man of iron, such as Talus, by our poet Spencer, is feigned to be the page of justice, who with his iron flail could do all this, and expeditiously, without those deceitful forms and circumstances of law, worse than ceremonies in religion; I say, God send it done, whether by one Talus, or by a thousand.

"But they subdued the men of conscience in parliament, backed and abetted all seditious and schismatical proposals against government ecclesiastical and civil."

Now we may perceive the root of his hatred, whence it springs. It was not the king's grace or princely goodness, but this iron flail, the people, that drove the bishops out of their baronies, out of their cathedrals, out of the lords house, out of their copes and surplices, and all those papistical innovations, threw down the high-commission and star-chamber, gave us a triennial parliament, and what we most desired; in revenge whereof he now so bitterly inveighs against them: these are those seditious and schismatical proposals then by him condescended to as acts of grace, now of another name; which declares him, touching matters of Church and state, to have been no other man in the deepest of his solitude, than he was before at the highest of his sovereignty.

But this was not the worst of these tumults, they played the hasty "midwives, and would not stay the ripening, but went straight to ripping up, and forcibly cut out abortive votes."

They

They would not stay perhaps the Spanish demurring, and putting off such wholesome acts and counsels, as the politic cabinet at Whitehall had no mind to. But all this is complained here as done to the parliament, and yet we heard not the parliament, at that time complain of any violence from the people, but from him. Wherefore intrudes he to plead the cause of parliament against the people, while the parliament was pleading their own cause against him, and against him were forced to seek refuge of the people? It is plain then that those confluxes and resorts interrupted not the parliament, nor by them were thought tumultuous, but by him only and his court-faction.

“But what good man had not rather want any thing he most desired for the public good, than attain it by such unlawful and irreligious means?” As much as to say, had not rather sit still, and let his country be tyrannized, than that the people, finding no other remedy, should stand up like men, and demand their rights and liberties. This is the artificialest piece of finesse to persuade men to be slaves, that the wit of court could have invented. But hear how much better the moral of this lesson would besit the teacher; What good man had not rather want a boundless and arbitrary power, and those fine flowers of the crown, called prerogatives, than for them to use force and perpetual vexation to his faithful subjects, nay to wade for them through blood and civil war? So that this and the whole bundle of those following sentences may be applied better to the conviction of his own violent courses, than of those pretended tumults.

“Who were the chief demagogues to send for those tumults, some alive are not ignorant.” Setting aside the affrightment of this goblin word; for the king, by his leave, cannot coin English, as he could money, to be current (and it is believed this wording was above his known stile and orthography, and accuses the whole composure to be conscious of some other author) yet if the people were sent for, emboldened and directed by those Demagogues, who, saving his Greek, were good patriots, and by his own confession “men of some repute for parts and piety,” it helps well to assure us there was both urgent cause, and the less danger of their coming.

“Complaints were made, yet no redress could be obtained.” The parliament also complained of what danger they fate in from another party, and demanded of him a guard, but it was not granted. What marvel then if it cheered them to see some store of their friends, and in the Roman, not the pettifogging sense, their clients so near about them; a defence due by nature both from whom it was offered, and to whom, as due as to their parents; tho’ the court stormed and fretted to see such honour given to them, who were then best fathers of the commonwealth. And both the parliament and people complained, and demanded justice for those assaults, if not murders done at his own doors by that crew of rufflers; but he, instead of doing justice on them, justified and abetted them in what they did, as in his public answer to a petition from the city may be read. Neither is it slightly to be passed over, that in the very place where blood was first drawn in this cause, as the beginning of all that followed, there was his own blood shed by the executioner: According to that sentence of divine justice, “in the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth, shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine.”

From hence he takes occasion to excuse that improvident and fatal error of his absenting from the parliament. “When he found that no declaration of the bishops could take place against those tumults.” Was that worth his considering, that foolish and self-undoing declaration of twelve cypher bishops, who were immediately appeached of treason for that audacious declaring? The bishops peradventure were now and then pulled by the rochets, and deserved another kind of pulling; but what amounted this to “the fear of his own person in the streets?” Did he not the very next day after his irruption into the house of commons, than which nothing had more exasperated the people, go in his coach unguarded into the city? Did he receive the least affront, much less violence, in any of the streets, but rather humble demeanors and supplications? Hence may be gathered, that however in his own guiltiness he might have justly feared, yet that he knew the

people so full of awe and reverence to his person, as to dare commit himself single among the thickest of them, at a time when he had most provoked them. Besides, in Scotland they had handled the bishops in a more robustious manner; Edinburgh had been full of tumults, two armies from thence had entred England against him: yet after all this he was not fearful, but very forward to take so long a journey to Edinburgh; which argues first, as did also his rendition afterward to the Scots army, that to England he continued still, as he was indeed, a stranger, and full of diffidence; to the Scots only a native king, in his confidence, tho' not in his dealing towards them. It shews us next beyond doubting, that all this his fear of tumults was but a mere pretence and occasion taken of his resolved absence from the parliament, for some other end not difficult to be guessed. And those instances wherein valour is not to be questioned for not "scuffling with the sea, or an undisciplined rabble," are but subservient to carry on the solemn jest of his fearing tumults; if they discover not withal the true reason why he departed, only to turn his slashing at the court-gate to slaughtering in the field; his disorderly bickering to an orderly invading; which was nothing else but a more orderly disorder.

"Some suspected and affirmed that he meditated a war, when he went first from Whitehall." And they were not the worst heads that did so, nor did any of his former acts weaken him to that, as he alledges for himself; or if they had, they clear him only for the time of passing them, not for whatever thoughts might come after into his mind. Former actions of improvidence or fear, not with him unusual, cannot absolve him of all after-meditations.

He goes on protesting his "no intention to have left Whitehall," had these horrid tumults given him but fair quarter, as if he himself, his wife and children had been in peril. But to this enough hath been answered.

"Had this parliament, as it was in its first election," namely with the lord and baron bishops, "sate full and free," he doubts not but all had gone well. What warrant this of his to us, whose not doubting was all good men's greatest doubt?

"He was resolved to hear reason, and to consent so far as he could comprehend." A hopeful resolution: what if his reason were found by oft experience to comprehend nothing beyond his own advantages; was this a reason fit to be intrusted with the common good of three nations?

But, saith he, "as swine are to gardens, so are tumults to parliaments." This the parliament, had they found it so, could best have told us. In the mean while, who knows not that one great hog may do as much mischief in a garden as many little swine? "He was sometimes prone to think, that had he called this last parliament to any other place in England, the sad consequences might have been prevented." But change of air changes not the mind. Was not his first parliament at Oxford dissolved after two subsidies given him, and no justice received? Was not his last in the same place, where they sate with as much freedom, as much quiet from tumults as they could desire, a parliament, both in his account and their own, consisting of all his friends, that fled after him, and suffered for him, and yet by him nicknamed, and cashiered for a "mungrel parliament, that vexed his queen with their base and mutinous motions?" as his cabinet-letter tells us. Whereby the world may see plainly, that no shifting of place, no sifting of members to his own mind, no number, no paucity, no freedom from tumults could ever bring his arbitrary wilfulness, and tyrannical designs to brook the least shape or similitude, the least counterfeit of a parliament.

Finally, instead of praying for his people as a good king should do, he prays to be delivered from them, as "from wild beasts, inundations, and raging seas, that had overborn all loyalty, modesty, laws, justice, and religion." God save the people from such intercessors!

V. Upon the bill for triennial parliaments, and for settling this, &c.

THE bill for triennial parliaments was doubtless a good bill, and the other for settling this was at that time very expedient; and in the king's own words no more than what the world "was fully confirmed he might in justice, reason, honour, and conscience grant them;" for to that end he affirms to have done it.

But whereas he attributes the passing of them to his own act of grace and willingness, as his manner is to make virtues of his necessities, and giving to himself all the praise, heaps ingratitude upon the parliament, a little memory will set the clean contrary before us; that for those beneficial acts we owe what we owe to the parliament: but to his granting them neither praise nor thanks. The first bill granted much less than two former statutes yet in force by Edward the third; that a parliament should be called every year, or oftener, if need were: nay, from a far ancients law-book called the "Mirror," it is affirmed in a late treatise called "Rights of the kingdom," that parliaments by our old laws ought twice a year to be at London. The second was so necessary, that nothing in the power of man, more seemed to be the stay and support of all things from that steep ruin to which he had nigh brought them, than that act obtained. He had by his ill stewardship, and, to say no worse, the needless raising of two armies intended for a civil war, beggared both himself and the public; and besides had left us upon the score of his needy enemies for what it cost them in their own defence against him. To disengage him and the kingdom great sums were to be borrowed, which would never have been lent, nor could ever be paid, had the king chanced to dissolve this parliament as heretofore. The errors also of his government had brought the kingdom to such extremes, as were incapable of all recovery without the absolute continuance of this parliament. It had been else in vain to go about the settling of so great distempers, if he, who first caused the malady, might, when he pleased, reject the remedy. Notwithstanding all which, that he granted both these acts unwillingly, and as a mere passive instrument, was then visible even to most of those men who now will see nothing.

At passing of the former act he himself concealed not his unwillingness; and testifying a general dislike of their actions, which they then proceeded in with great approbation of the whole kingdom, he told them with a masterly brow, that "by this act he had obliged them above what they had deserved," and gave a piece of justice to the commonwealth three times short of his predecessors, as if he had been giving some boon, or begged office to a sort of his desertless grooms.

That he passed the latter act against his will, no man in reason can hold it questionable. For if the February before he made so dainty, and were so loth to bestow a parliament once in three years upon the nation, because this had so opposed his courses, was it likely that the May following he should bestow willingly on this parliament an indissoluble sitting, when they had offended him much more by cutting short and impeaching of high treason his chief favourites? It was his fear then, not his favour, which drew from him that act, lest the parliament incensed by his conspiracies against them, about the same time discovered, should with the people have resented too heinously those his doings, if to the suspicion of their danger from him, he had also added the denial of this only means to secure themselves.

From these acts therefore in which he glories, and wherewith so oft he upbraids the parliament, he cannot justly expect to reap aught but dishonour and dispraise; as being both unwillingly granted, and the one granting much less than was before allowed by statute, the other being a testimony of his violent and lawless custom, not only to break privileges, but whole parliaments; from which enormity they were constrained to bind him first of all his predecessors; never any before him having given like causes of distrust and

jealousy to his people. As for this parliament, how far he was from being advised by them, as he ought, let his own words express.

He taxes them with "undoing what they found well done:" and yet knows they undid nothing in the Church but lord bishops, liturgies, ceremonies, high commission, judged worthy by all true protestants to be thrown out of the Church. They undid nothing in the state but irregular and grinding courts, the main grievances to be removed; and if these were the things which in his opinion they found well done, we may again from hence be informed with what unwillingness he removed them; and that those gracious acts whereof so frequently he makes mention, may be englished more properly acts of fear and dissimulation against his mind and conscience.

The bill preventing dissolution of this parliament he calls "an unparalleled act, out of the extreme confidence that his subjects would not make ill use of it." But was it not a greater confidence of the people to put into one man's hand so great a power, till he abused it, as to summon and dissolve parliaments? He would be thanked for trusting them, and ought to thank them rather for trusting him: the trust issuing first from them, not from him.

And that it was a mere trust, and not his prerogative, to call and dissolve parliaments at his pleasure; and that parliaments were not to be dissolved, till all petitions were heard, all grievances redressed, is not only the assertion of this parliament, but of our ancient law-books, which aver it to be an unwritten law of common right, so ingraven in the hearts of our ancestors, and by them so constantly enjoyed and claimed, as that it needed not enrolling. And if the Scots in their declaration could charge the king with breach of their laws for breaking up that parliament without their consent, while matters of greatest moment were depending; it were unreasonable to imagine that the wisdom of England should be so wanting to itself through all ages, as not to provide by some known law, written or unwritten, against the not calling, or the arbitrary dissolving of parliaments; or that they who ordained their summoning twice a year, or as oft as need required, did not tacitly enact also, that as necessity of affairs called them, so the same necessity should keep them undissolved till that were fully satisfied. Were it not for that, parliaments, and all the fruit and benefit we receive by having them, would turn soon to mere abusio. It appears then that if this bill of not dissolving were an unparalleled act, it was a known and common right which our ancestors under other kings enjoyed as firmly as if it had been graven in marble; and that the infringement of this king first brought it into a written act: Who now boasts that as a great favour done us, which his own less fidelity than was in former kings, constrained us only of an old undoubted right, to make a new written act. But what needed written acts, whenas anciently it was esteemed part of his crown-oath not to dissolve parliaments till all grievances were considered? whereupon the old "Modi of Parliament," calls it flat perjury, if he dissolve them before; as I find cited in a book mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, to which and other law-tracts I refer the more lawyerly mooting of this point, which is neither my element, nor my proper work here; since the book which I have to answer, pretends to reason, not to authorities and quotations: and I hold reason to be the best arbitrator, and the law of law itself.

It is true, that "good subjects think it not just that the king's condition should be worse by bettering theirs." But then the king must not be at such a distance from the people in judging what is better and what worse; which might have been agreed, had he known (for his own words condemn him) "as well with moderation to use, as with earnestness to desire his own advantages."

"A continual parliament he thought would keep the commonwealth in tune." Judge, commonwealth, what proofs he gave that this boasted profession was ever in his thought.

Some, saith he, "gave out that I repented me of that settling act." His own actions gave it out beyond all supposition; for doubtless it repented him to have established that by law, which he went about so soon after to abrogate by the sword.

He calls those acts which he confesses "tended to their good, not more princely than friendly contributions:." As if to do his duty were of courtesy, and the discharge of his trust a parcel of his liberality; so nigh lost in his esteem was the birth-right of our liberties, that to give them back again upon demand, stood at the mercy of his contribution.

"He doubts not but the affections of his people will compensate his sufferings for those acts of confidence:." And imputes his sufferings to a contrary cause. Not his confidence but his distrust was that which brought him to those sufferings, from the time that he forsook his parliament; and trusted them never the sooner for what he tells "of their piety and religious strictness," but rather hated them as puritans, whom he always fought to extirpate.

He would have it believed that "to bind his hands by these acts, argued a very short foresight of things, and extreme fatuity of mind in him," if he had meant a war. If we should conclude so, that were not the only argument: neither did it argue that he meant peace; knowing that what he granted for the present out of fear, he might as soon repeal by force, watching his time; and deprive them the fruit of those acts, if his own designs wherein he put his trust, took effect.

Yet he complains, "that the tumults threatened to abuse all acts of grace, and turn them into wantonness." I would they had turned his wantonness into the grace of not abusing Scripture. Was this becoming such a saint as they would make him, to adulterate those sacred words from the grace of God to the acts of his own grace? Herod was eaten up of worms for suffering others to compare his voice to the voice of God; but the borrower of this phrase gives much more cause of jealousy, that he likened his own acts of grace to the acts of God's grace.

From prophaneness he scarce comes off with perfect sense. "I was not then in a capacity to make war, therefore I intended not. I was not in a capacity, therefore I could not have given my enemies greater advantage than by so unprincely inconstancy to have scattered them by arms, whom but lately I had settled by parliament." What place could there be for his inconstancy to do that thing whereto he was in no capacity? Otherwise his inconstancy was not so unwonted, or so nice, but that it would have easily found pretences to scatter those in revenge whom he settled in fear.

"It had been a course full of sin as well as of hazard and dishonour." True; but if those considerations withheld him not from other actions of like nature, how can we believe they were of strength sufficient to withhold him from this? And that they withheld him not, the event soon taught us.

"His letting some men go up to the pinnacle of the temple, was a temptation to them to cast him down headlong." In this Simile we have himself compared to Christ, the parliament to the Devil, and his giving them that act of settling, to his letting them go up to the "Pinnacle of the Temple." A tottering and giddy act rather than a settling. This was goodly use made of Scripture in his solitudes: But it was no pinnacle of the temple, it was a pinnacle of Nebuchadnezzar's palace from whence he and monarchy fell headlong together.

He would have others see that "all the kingdoms of the world are not worth gaining by ways of sin which hazard the soul;" and hath himself left nothing unhazarded to keep three. He concludes with sentences that rightly scanned, make not so much for him as against him, and confesses that "the act of settling was no sin of his will;" and we easily believe him, for it hath been clearly proved a sin of his unwillingness.

With his orisons I meddle not, for he appeals to a high audit. This yet may be noted, that at his prayers he had before him the sad presage of ill success, "as of a dark and dangerous storm, which never admitted his return to the port from whence he set out."

out. Yet his prayer-book no sooner shut, but other hopes flattered him; and their flattering was his destruction.

VI. Upon his retirement from Westminster.

THE simile wherewith he begins, I was about to have found fault with, as in a garb somewhat more poetical than for a statift: but meeting with many strains of like drefs in other of his essays, and him hearing reported a more diligent reader of poets, than of politicians, I begun to think that the whole book might perhaps be intended a piece of poetry. The words are good, the fiction smooth and cleanly; there wanted only rhyme, and that they say is bestowed upon it lately. But to the argument.

"I staid at Whitehall, till I was driven away by shame more than fear." I retract not what I thought of the fiction, yet here, I must confess, it lies too open. In his messages and declarations, nay in the whole chapter next but one before this, he affirms that "the danger wherein his wife, his children, and his own person" were by those tumults, was the main cause that drove him from Whitehall, and appeals to God as witness: he affirms here that it was "shame more than fear." And Digby, who knew his mind as well as any, tells his new-listed guard, "that the principal cause of his majesty's going thence, was to save them from being trod in the dirt. From whence we may discern what false and frivolous excuses are avowed for truth, either in those declarations, or in this penitential book. Our forefathers were of that courage and severity of zeal to justice and their native liberty, against the proud contempt and misrule of their kings, that when Richard the Second departed but from a committee of lords who sate preparing matter for the parliament, not yet assembled, to the removal of his evil counsellors, they first vanquished and put to flight Robert de Vere his chief favourite; and then coming up to London with a huge army, required the king then withdrawn for fear, but no further off than the Tower, to come to Westminster. Which he refusing, they told him flatly, that unless he came they would chuse another. So high a crime it was accounted then for kings to absent themselves, not from a parliament, which none ever durst, but from any meeting of his peers and counsellors which did but tend towards a parliament. Much less would they have suffered that a king for such trivial and various pretences, one while for fear of tumults, another while "for shame to see them," should leave his royal station, and the whole kingdom bleeding to death of those wounds which his own unskilful and perverse government had inflicted.

Shame then it was that drove him from the parliament, but the shame of what? Was it the shame of his manifold errors and misdeeds, and to see how weakly he had played the king? No; "but to see the barbarous rudeness of those tumults to demand any thing." We have started here another, and I believe the truest cause of his deserting the parliament. The worst and strangest of that "Any-thing" which the people then demanded, was but the unlording of bishops, and expelling them the house, and the reducing of Church-discipline to a conformity with other protestant churches; this was the barbarism of those tumults: and that he might avoid the granting of those honest and pious demands, as well demanded by the parliament as the people, for this very cause more than for fear, by his own confession here, he left the city; and in a most tempestuous season forsook the helm and steerage of the commonwealth. This was that terrible "Any-thing" from which his Conscience and his Reason chose to run rather than not deny. To be importuned the removing of evil counsellors, and other grievances in Church and state, was to him "an intolerable oppression." If the people's demanding were so burdensome to him, what was his denial and delay of justice to them?

But as the demands of his people were to him a burden and oppression, so was the advice of his parliament esteemed a bondage; "Whose agreeing votes," as he affirms, "were not

not by any law or reason conclusive to his judgment." For the law, it ordains a parliament to advise him in his great affairs; but if it ordain also that the single judgment of a king shall out-balance all the wisdom of his parliament, it ordains that which frustrates the end of its own ordaining. For where the king's judgment may dissent, to the destruction, as it may happen, both of himself and the kingdom, there advice, and no further, is a most insufficient and frustraneous means to be provided by law in cases of so high concernment. It being therefore most unlike a law, to ordain a remedy so slender and unlawlike, to be the utmost means of all public safety or prevention, as advice is, which may at any time be rejected by the sole judgment of one man, the king, and so unlike the law of England, which lawyers say is the quintessence of reason; we may conclude that the king's negative voice was never any law, but an absurd and reasonless custom, begotten and grown up either from the flattery of basest times, or the usurpation of immoderate princes. Thus much to the law of it, by a better evidence than rolls and records, reason.

But is it possible he should pretend also to reason, that the judgment of one man, not as a wise or good man, but as a king, and oft-times a wilful, proud, and wicked king, should outweigh the prudence and all the virtue of an elected parliament? What an abusive thing it were then to summon parliaments, that by the major part of voices greatest matters may be there debated and resolved, whenas one voice after that shall dash all their resolutions?

He attempts to give a reason why it should, "Because the whole parliament represents not him in any kind." But mark how little he advances; for if the parliament represent the whole kingdom, as is sure enough they do, then doth the king represent only himself; and if a king without his kingdom be in a civil sense nothing, then without or against the representative of his whole kingdom, he himself represents nothing; and by consequence his judgment and his negative is as good as nothing: and though we should allow him to be something, yet not equal or comparable to the whole kingdom, and so neither to them that represent it.

Yet here he maintains, "to be no further bound to agree with the votes of both houses, than he sees them to agree with the will of God, with his just rights as a king, and the general good of his people." As to the freedom of his agreeing or not agreeing, limited with due bounds, no man reprehends it; this is the question here, or the miracle rather, why his only not agreeing should lay a negative bar and inhibition upon that which is agreed to by a whole parliament, though never so conducing to the public good or safety. To know the will of God better than his whole kingdom, whence should he have it? Certainly court-breeding and his perpetual conversation with flatterers, was but a bad school. To judge of his own rights could not belong to him, who had no right by law in any court to judge of so much as felony or treason, being held a party in both these cases, much more in this; and his rights however should give place to the general good, for which end all his rights were given him. Lastly, to suppose a clearer insight and discerning of the general good, allotted to his own singular judgment, than to the parliament and all the people, and from that self-opinion of discerning, to deny them that good which they, being all freemen, seek earnestly and call for, is an arrogance and iniquity beyond imagination rude and unreasonable; they undoubtedly having most authority to judge of the public good, who for that purpose are chosen out and sent by the people to advise him. And if it may be in him to see oft "the major part of them not in the right," had it not been more his modesty to have doubted their seeing him more often in the wrong?

He passes to another reason of his denials, "because of some men's hydropic unsatiableness, and thirst of asking, the more they drank, whom no fountain of regal bounty was able to overcome." A comparison more properly bestowed on those that came to guzzle in his wine cellar, than on a freeborn people that came to claim in parliament their rights and

and liberties, which a king ought therefore to grant, because of right demanded; not to deny them for fear his bounty should be exhausted, which in these demands (to continue the same metaphor) was not so much as broached; it being his duty, not his bounty to grant these things.

Putting off the courtier, he now puts on the philosopher, and sententiously disputes to this effect, "That reason ought to be used to men, force and terror to beasts; that he deserves to be a slave, who captivates the rational sovereignty of his soul and liberty of his will to compulsion; that he would not forfeit that freedom which cannot be denied him as a king, because it belongs to him as a man and a christian, though to preserve his kingdom; but rather die enjoying the empire of his soul, than live in such a vassalage, as not to use his reason and conscience to like or dislike as a king." Which words, of themselves, as far as they are sense, good and philosophical, yet in the mouth of him who to engross this common liberty to himself, would tread down all other men into the condition of slaves and beasts, they quite lose their commendation. He confesses a rational sovereignty of soul, and freedom of will in every man, and yet with an implicit repugnancy would have his reason the sovereign of that sovereignty, and would captivate and make useless that natural freedom of will in all other men but himself. But them that yield him this obedience he so well rewards, as to pronounce them worthy to be slaves. They who have lost all to be his subjects, may stoop and take up the reward. What that freedom is, which "cannot be denied him as a king, because it belongs to him as a man and a christian," I understand not. If it be his negative voice, it concludes all men who have not such a negative as his against a whole parliament, to be neither men nor christians: and what was he himself then, all this while that we denied it him as a king? Will he say that he enjoyed within himself the less freedom for that? Might not he, both as a man and as a christian, have reigned within himself in full sovereignty of soul, no man repining, but that his outward and imperious will must invade the civil liberties of a nation? Did we therefore not permit him to use his reason or his conscience, not permitting him to bereave us the use of ours? And might not he have enjoyed both as a king, governing us as free-men by what laws we ourselves would be governed? It was not the inward use of his reason and his conscience that would content him, but to use them both as a law over all his subjects, "in whatever he declared as a king to like or dislike." Which use of reason, most reasonless and unconscionable, is the utmost that any tyrant ever pretended over his vassals.

In all wise nations the legislative power, and the judicial execution of that power, have been most commonly distinct, and in several hands; but yet the former supreme, the other subordinate. If then the king be only set up to execute the law, which is indeed the highest of his office, he ought no more to make or forbid the making of any law agreed upon in parliament, than other inferior judges, who are his deputies. Neither can he more reject a law offered him by the commons, than he can now make a law which they reject. And yet the more to credit and uphold his cause, he would seem to have philosophy on his side, straining her wise dictates to unphilosophical purposes. But when kings come so low, as to fawn upon philosophy, which before they neither valued nor understood, it is a sign that fails not, they are then put to their last trump. And philosophy as well requites them, by not suffering her golden sayings either to become their lips, or to be used as masks and colours of injurious and violent deeds. So that what they presume to borrow from her sage and virtuous rules, like the riddle of Sphinx not understood, breaks the neck of their own cause.

But now again to politics: "He cannot think the Majesty of the crown of England to be bound by any coronation oath in a blind and brutish formality, to consent to whatever its subjects in parliament shall require." What tyrant could presume to say more, when he meant to kick down all law; government, and bond of oath? But why he so desires to absolve himself the oath of his coronation, would be worth the knowing. It cannot but be

be yielded that the oath which binds him to performance of his trust, ought in reason to contain the sum of what his chief trust and office is. But if it neither do enjoin, nor mention to him, as a part of his duty, the making or the marring of any law, or scrap of law, but requires only his assent to those laws which the people have already chosen, or shall chuse (for so both the Latin of that oath, and the old English, and all reason admits, that the people should not lose under a new king what freedom they had before) then that negative voice so contended for, to deny the passing of any law which the commons chose, is both against the oath of his coronation, and his kingly office. And if the king may deny to pass what the parliament hath chosen to be a law, then doth the king make himself superior to his whole kingdom; which not only the general maxims of policy gainsay, but even our own standing laws, as hath been cited to him in remonstrances heretofore, that "the king hath two superiors, the law, and his court of parliament." But this he counts to be a blind and brutish formality, whether it be law, or oath, or his duty, and thinks to turn it off with wholesome words and phrases, which he then first learnt of the honest people, when they were so often compelled to use them against those more truly blind and brutish formalities thrust upon us by his own command.

As for his instance, in case "He and the House of Peers attempted to enjoin the House of Commons," it bears no equality; for he and the peers represent but themselves, the commons are the whole kingdom.

Thus he concludes "his oath to be fully discharged in governing by laws already made," as being not bound to pass any new, "if his reason bids him deny." And so may infinite mischiefs grow, and a whole nation be ruined, while our general good and safety shall depend upon the private and overweening reason of one obstinate man, who against all the kingdom, if he list, will interpret both the law and his oath of coronation by the tenor of his own will. Which he himself confesses to be an arbitrary power, yet doubts not in his argument to imply, as if he thought it more fit the parliament should be subject to his will, than he to their advice; a man neither by nature nor by nurture wise. How is it possible that he in whom such principles as these were so deep rooted, could ever, though restored again, have reigned otherwise than tyrannically?

He objects, "That force was but a slavish method to dispel his error." But how often shall it be answered him, that no force was used to dispel the error out of his head, but to drive it from off our necks? for his error was imperious, and would command all other men to renounce their own reason and understanding, till they perished under the injunction of his all-ruling error.

He alledges the uprightness of his intentions to excuse his possible failings; a position false both in law and divinity: yea, contrary to his own better principles, who affirms in the twelfth chapter, that "the goodness of a man's intention will not excuse the scandal and contagion of his example." His not knowing, through the corruption of flattery and court-principles, what he ought to have known, will not excuse his not doing what he ought to have done; no more than the small skill of him who undertakes to be a Pilot will excuse him to be misled by any wandring star mistaken for the Pole. But let his intentions be never so upright, what is that to us? what answer for the reason and the national rights which God hath given us, if having parliaments, and laws, and the power of making more to avoid mischief, we suffer one man's blind intentions to lead us all with our eyes open to manifest destruction?

And if arguments prevail not with such a one, force is well used; not "to carry on the weakness of our counsels, or to convince his error," as he surmises, but to acquit and rescue our own reason, our own consciences from the force and prohibition laid by his usurping error upon our liberties and understandings.

"Never any thing pleased him more, than when his judgment concurred with theirs." That was to the applause of his own judgment, and would as well have pleased any self-conceited man.

“ Yea, in many things he chose rather to deny himself than them.” That is to say, in trifles. For “ of his own interests ” and personal rights he conceives himself “ Master.” To part with, if he please, not to contest for, against the kingdom, which is greater than he, whose rights are all subordinate to the kingdom’s good : and “ in what concerns truth, justice, the right of church, or his crown, no man shall gain his consent against his mind.” What can be left then for a parliament, but to sit like images, while he still thus with incomparable arrogance assumes to himself the best ability of judging for other men what is truth, justice, goodness, what his own or the church’s right, or with unsufferable tyranny restrains all men from the enjoyment of any good, which his judgment, though erroneous, thinks not fit to grant them ; notwithstanding that the law and his coronal oath requires his undeniable assent to what laws the parliament agree upon.

“ He had rather wear a crown of thorns with our Saviour.” Many would be all one with our Saviour, whom our Saviour will not know. They who govern ill those kingdoms which they had a right to, have to our Saviour’s crown of thorns no right at all. Thorns they may find enow of their own gathering, and their own twisting ; for thorns and snares, saith Solomon, are in the way of the froward : but to wear them, as our Saviour wore them, is not given to them who suffer by their own demerits. Nor is a crown of gold his due, who cannot first wear a crown of lead ; not only for the weight of that great office, but for the compliance which it ought to have with them who are to counsel him, which here he terms in scorn “ An imbased flexibleness to the various and oft contrary dictates of any factions,” meaning his parliament ; for the question hath been all this while between them two. And to his parliament, though a numerous and choice assembly, of whom the land thought wisest, he imputes, rather than to himself, “ want of reason, neglect of the public, interest of parties, and particularly of private will and passion ;” but with what modesty or likelihood of truth, it will be wearisome to repeat so often.

He concludes with a sentence fair in seeming, but fallacious. For if the conscience be ill edified, the resolution may more besit a foolish than a christian king, to prefer a self-willed conscience before a kingdom’s good ; especially in the denial of that which law and his regal office by oath bids him grant to his parliament and whole kingdom rightfully demanding. For we may observe him throughout the discourse to assert his negative power against the whole kingdom ; now under the specious plea of his conscience and his reason, but heretofore in a louder note ; “ Without us, or against our consent, the votes of either or of both houses together, must not, cannot, shall not.” Declar. May 4. 1642.

With these and the like deceivable doctrines, he leuens also his prayer.

VII. Upon the Queen’s departure.

TO this argument we shall soon have said ; for what concerns it us to hear a husband divulge his household privacies, extolling to others the virtues of his wife ? an infirmity not seldom incident to those who have least cause. But how good she was a wife, was to himself, and be it left to his own fancy ; how bad a subject, is not much disputed. And being rich, it need be made no wonder, though she left a protestant kingdom with as little honour as her mother left a popish.

That this “ is the first example of any protestant subjects that have taken up arms against their king a protestant,” can be to protestants no dishonour ; when it shall be heard that he first levied war on them, and to the interest of papists more than of protestants. He might have given yet the precedence of making war upon him to the subjects of his own nation, who had twice opposed him in the open field long ere the English found it necessary to do the like. And how groundless, how dissembled is that fear, lest she, who for so many years had been averse from the religion of her husband, and every year more and

and more before these disturbances broke out, should for them be now the more alienated from that to which we never heard she was inclined? But if the fear of her delinquency, and that justice which the protestants demanded on her, was any cause of her alienating the more, to have gained her by indirect means had been no advantage to religion, much less then was the detriment to lose her further off. It had been happy if his own actions had not given cause of more scandal to the protestants, than what they did against her could justly scandalize any papist.

Them who accused her, well enough known to be the parliament, he censures for "Men yet to seek their Religion, whether Doctrine, Discipline, or Good Manners;" the rest he fooths with the name of true English protestants, a meer schismatical name, yet he so great an enemy of schism.

He ascribes "rudeness and barbarity, worse than Indian," to the English parliament; and "all virtue" to his wife, in strains that come almost to sonnetting: how fit to govern men, undervaluing and aspersing the great council of his kingdom, in comparison of one woman! Examples are not far to seek, how great mischief and dishonour hath fallen to nations under the government of effeminate and uxorious magistrates, who being themselves governed and overwayed at home under a feminine usurpation, cannot but be far short of spirit and authority without doors, to govern a whole nation.

"Her tarrying here he could not think safe among them who were shaking hands with allegiance, to lay faster hold on religion;" and taxes them of a duty rather than a crime, it being just to obey God rather than man, and impossible to serve two masters: I would they had quite shaken off what they stood shaking hands with; the fault was in their courage, not in their cause.

In his prayer he prays that "the disloyalty of his protestant subjects may not be a hindrance to her love of the true religion;" and never prays, that the dissoluteness of his court, the scandals of his clergy, the unsoundness of his judgment, the lukewarmness of his life, his letter of compliance to the pope, his permitting agents at Rome, and the pope's Nuncio here, may not be found in the sight of God far greater hindrances to her conversion.

But this had been a subtle prayer indeed, and well prayed, though as duly as a Pater-noster, if it could have charmed us to sit still and have religion and our liberties one by one snatched from us, for fear lest rising to defend ourselves, we should fright the Queen, a stiff papist, from turning protestant. As if the way to make his queen a protestant, had been to make his subjects more than half-way papists.

He prays next "that his constancy may be an antidote against the poison of other men's example." His constancy in what? Not in religion, for it is openly known that her religion wrought more upon him, than his religion upon her; and his open favouring of papists, and his hatred of them called puritans, made most men suspect she had quite perverted him. But what is it that the blindness of hypocrisy dares not do? It dares pray, and thinks to hide that from the eyes of God, which it cannot hide from the open view of man.

VIII. Upon his Repulse at Hull, and the Fate of the Hothams.

HULL, a town of great strength and opportunity both to sea and land-affairs, was at that time the magazine of all those arms which the king had bought with money most illegally extorted from his subjects of England, to use in a causeless and most unjust civil war against his subjects of Scotland. The king in high discontent and anger had left the parliament, and was gone toward the North, the queen into Holland, where she pawned and set to sail the crown-jewels (a crime heretofore counted treasonable in kings) and to what intent these sums were raised, the parliament was not ignorant. His going northward in so high a chafe, they doubted was to possess himself of that strength,

strength, which the store-house and situation of Hull might add suddenly to his malignant party. Having first therefore in many petitions earnestly prayed him to dispose and settle, with consent of both houses, the military power in trusty hands, and he as oft refusing, they were necessitated by the turbulence and danger of those times to put the kingdom by their own authority into a posture of defence; and very timely sent Sir John Hotham, a member of the house, and knight of that county, to take Hull into his custody, and some of the trained-bands to his assistance: Neither had the king before that time omitted to attempt the same, first by colonel Legg, one of those who were employed to bring the army up against the parliament, then by the earl of Newcastle under a disguise. And letters of the lord Digby were intercepted, wherein was wished that the king would declare himself, and retire to some safe place; other information came from abroad, that Hull was the place designed for some new enterprize. But these attempts not succeeding, and that town being now in custody of the parliament, he sends a message to them, that he had firmly resolved to go in person into Ireland, to chastise those wicked rebels (for these and worse words he then gave them) and that towards this work he intended forthwith to raise by his commissions, in the counties near Westchester, a guard for his own person, consisting of 2000 foot, and 200 horse, that should be armed from his magazine at Hull. On the other side, the parliament, foreseeing the king's drift, about the same time send him a petition, that they might have leave for necessary causes to remove the magazine of Hull to the tower of London; to which the king returns his denial; and soon after going to Hull, attended with about 400 horse, requires the governor to deliver him up the town: whereof the governor besought humbly to be excused, till he could send notice to the parliament who had intrusted him; whereat the king much incensed, proclaims him traitor before the town-walls, and gives immediate order to stop all passages between him and the parliament. Yet he himself dispatches post after post to demand justice, as upon a traitor, using a strange iniquity to require justice upon him whom he then way-laid and debarred from his appearance. The parliament no sooner understood what had passed, but they declare that Sir John Hotham had done no more than was his duty, and was therefore no traitor.

This relation being most true, proves that which is affirmed here to be most false; seeing the parliament, whom he accounts his "greatest Enemies," had "more confidence to abet and own" what Sir John Hotham had done, than the king had confidence to let him answer in his own behalf.

To speak of his patience, and in that solemn manner, he might better have forborn; "God knows," saith he, "it affected me more with sorrow for others than with anger for myself; nor did the affront trouble me so much as their sin." This is read, I doubt not, and believed: and as there is some use of every thing, so is there of this book, were it but to shew us, what a miserable, credulous, deluded thing that creature is, which is called the vulgar; who notwithstanding what they might know, will believe such vain-glories as these. Did not that cholerick and vengeful act of proclaiming him traitor before due process of law, having been convinced so late before of his illegality with the five members, declare his anger to be incensed? doth not his own relation confess as much? and his second message left him fuming three days after, and in plain words testifies "his impatience of delay" till Hotham be severely punished, for that which he there terms an insupportable affront.

Surely if his sorrow for Sir John Hotham's sin were greater than his anger for the affront, it was an exceeding great sorrow indeed, and wondrous charitable. But if it stirred him so vehemently to have Sir John Hotham punished, and not at all, that we hear, to have him repent, it had a strange operation to be called a sorrow for his sin. He who would persuade us of his sorrow for the sins of other men, as they are sins, not as they are sinned against himself, must give us first some testimony of a sorrow for his own sins, and next for such sins of other men as cannot be supposed a direct injury to himself.

But such compunction in the king no man hath yet observed; and till then, his sorrow for Sir John Hotham's sin will be called no other than the resentment of his repulse; and his labour to have the sinner only punished, will be called by a right name, his revenge.

And "the hand of that cloud which cast all soon after into darkness and disorder," was his own hand. For assembling the inhabitants of Yorkshire, and other counties, horse and foot, first under colour of a new guard to his person, soon after, being supplied with ammunition from Holland, bought with the crown-jewels, he begins an open war by laying siege to Hull: which town was not his own, but the kingdom's; and the arms there, public arms, bought with the public money, or not his own. Yet had they been his own by as good right as the private house and arms of any man are his own; to use either of them in a way not private, but suspicious to the commonwealth, no law permits. But the king had no propriety at all either in Hull or in the magazine: so that the following Maxims which he cites "of bold and disloyal undertakers," may belong more justly to whom he least meant them. After this he again relapses into the praise of his patience at Hull, and by his overtalking of it, seems to doubt either his own conscience, or the hardness of other men's belief. To me, the more he praises it in himself, the more he seems to suspect that in very deed it was not in him, and that the lookers on so likewise thought.

Thus much of what he suffered by Hotham, and with what patience; now of what Hotham suffered, as he judges, for opposing him: "He could not but observe how God not long after pleaded and avenged his cause." Most men are too apt, and commonly the worst of men, so to interpret and expound the judgments of God, and all other events of Providence or chance, as makes most to the justifying of their own cause, though never so evil; and attribute all to the particular favour of God towards them. Thus when Saul heard that David was in Keilah, "God" saith he, "hath delivered him up into my hands, for he is shut in." But how far that king was deceived in his thought that God was favouring to his cause, that story unfolds; and how little reason this king had to impute the death of Hotham to God's avengement of his repulse at Hull, may easily be seen. For while Hotham continued faithful to his trust, no man more safe, more successful, more in reputation than he: But from the time he first sought to make his peace with the king, and to betray into his hands that town, into which before he had denied him entrance, nothing prospered with him. Certainly had God purposed him such an end for his opposition to the king, he would not have deferred to punish him till then, when of an enemy he was changed to be the king's friend, nor have made his repentance and amendment the occasion of his ruin. How much more likely is it, since he fell into the act of disloyalty to his charge, that the judgment of God concurred with the punishment of man, and justly cut him off for revolting to the king? To give the world an example, that glorious deeds done to ambitious ends, find reward answerable, not to their outward seeming, but to their inward ambition. In the meanwhile, what thanks he had from the king for revolting to his cause, and what good opinion for dying in his service, they who have ventured like him, or intend, may here take notice.

He proceeds to declare, not only in general wherefore God's judgment was upon Hotham, but undertakes by fancies, and allusions, to give a criticism upon every particular: "That his head was divided from his body, because his heart was divided from the king; two heads cut off in one family for affronting the head of the commonwealth; the eldest son being infected with the sin of the father, against the father of his country." These petty glosses and conceits on the high and secret judgments of God, besides the boldness of unwarrantable commenting, are so weak and shallow, and so like the quibbles of a court-sermon, that we may safely reckon them either fetched from such a pattern, or that the hand of some household priest foisted them in, lest the world should forget how much
he

he was the disciple of those cymbal doctors. But that argument by which the author would commend them to us, discredits them the more: For if they be so "obvious to every fancy," the more likely to be erroneous, and to misconceive the mind of those high secrecies, whereof they presume to determine. For God judges not by human fancy.

But however God judged Hotham, yet he had the king's pity: but mark the reason how preposterous; so far he had his pity, "as he thought he at first acted more against the light of his conscience than many other men in the same cause." Questionless they who act against conscience, whether at the bar of human, or divine justice, are pitied least of all. These are the common grounds and verdicts of nature, whereof when he who hath the judging of a whole nation, is found destitute, under such a governor that nation must needs be miserable.

By the way he jerks at "some men's reforming to models of religion, and that they think all is gold of piety that doth but glister with a shew of zeal." We know his meaning, and apprehend how little hope there could be of him from such language as this: But are sure that the piety of his prelatie model, glistered more upon the posts and pillars which their zeal and fervency gilded over, than in the true works of spiritual edification.

"He is sorry that Hotham felt the justice of others, and fell not rather into the hands of his mercy." But to clear that, he should have shewn us what mercy he had ever used to such as fell into his hands before, rather than what mercy he intended to such as never could come to ask it. Whatever mercy one man might have expected, it is too well known the whole nation found none; though they besought it often, and so humbly; but had been swallowed up in blood and ruin, to set his private will above the parliament, had not his strength failed him. "Yet clemency he counts a debt, which he ought pay to those that crave it; since we pay not any thing to God for his mercy but prayers and praises." By this reason we ought as freely to pay all things to all men; for of all that we receive from God, what do we pay for, more than prayers and praises? we looked for the discharge of his office, the payment of his duty to the kingdom, and are paid court-payment with empty sentences that have the sound of gravity, but the significance of nothing pertinent.

Yet again after his mercy past and granted, he returns back to give sentence upon Hotham; and whom he tells us he would so fain have saved alive, him he never leaves killing with repeated condemnation, though dead long since. It was ill that somebody stood not near to whisper him, that a reiterating judge is worse than a tormentor. "He pities him, he rejoices not, he pities him" again; but still is sure to brand him at the tail of his pity with some ignominious mark, either of ambition or disloyalty. And with a kind of censorious pity, aggravates rather than lessens or conceals the fault: To pity thus, is to triumph.

He assumes to foreknow, that "after-times will dispute, whether Hotham were more infamous at Hull, or at Tower-hill." What knew he of after-times, who while he sits judging and censuring without end, the fate of that unhappy father and his son at Tower-hill, knew not that the like fate attended him before his own palace-gate; and as little knew whether after-times do not reserve a greater infamy upon his own life and reign.

He says but over again in his prayer, what his sermon hath preached: how acceptably to those in Heaven, we leave to be decided by that precept which forbids "vain Repetitions." Sure enough it lies as heavy as he can lay it, upon the head of poor Hotham.

Needs he will fasten upon God a piece of revenge as done for his sake; and takes it for a favour, before he know it was intended him: which in his closet had been excusable, but

but in a written and published prayer, too presumptuous. Ecclesiastes hath a right name for such kind of sacrifices.

Going on he prays thus, "Let not thy justice prevent the objects and opportunities of my mercy." To folly, or to blasphemy, or to both shall we impute this? Shall the justice of God give place, and serve to glorify the mercies of a man? All other men who know what they ask, desire of God that their doings may tend to his glory; but in this prayer, God is required that his justice would forbear to prevent, and as good have said to intrench upon the glory of a man's mercy. If God forbear his justice, it must be sure to the magnifying of his own mercy: But here a mortal man takes the boldness to ask that glory out of his hand. It may be doubted now by them who understand religion, whether the king were more unfortunate in this his prayer, or Hotham in those his sufferings.

IX. Upon the lifting and raising Armies, &c.

IT were an endless work to walk side by side with the verbosity of this chapter; only to what already hath not been spoken, convenient answer shall be given. He begins again with tumults; all demonstration of the people's love and loyalty to the parliament was tumult; their petitioning, tumult; their defensive armies were but lifted Tumults; and will take no notice that those about him, those in a time of peace lifted into his own house, were the beginners of all these tumults; abusing and assaulting not only such as came peaceably to the parliament at London, but those that came petitioning to the king himself at York. Neither did they abstain from doing violence and outrage to the messengers sent from parliament; he himself either countenancing or conniving at them.

He supposes that "his recess gave us confidence that he might be conquered." Other men suppose both that and all things else, who knew him neither by nature warlike, nor experienced, nor fortunate; so far was any man that discerned aught, from esteeming him unconquerable; yet such are readiest to imbroider others.

"But he had a soul invincible." What praise is that? The stomach of a child is oft-times invincible to all correction. The unteachable man hath a soul to all reason and good advice invincible; and he who is intractable, he whom nothing can persuade, may boast himself invincible; whenas in some things to be overcome, is more honest and laudable than to conquer.

He labours to have it thought that "his fearing God more than man" was the ground of his sufferings; but he should have known that a good principle not rightly understood may prove as hurtful as a bad, and his fear of God may be as faulty as a blind zeal. He pretended to fear God more than the parliament, who never urged him to do otherwise; he should also have feared God more than he did his courtiers, and the bishops who drew him, as they pleased, to things inconsistent with the fear of God. Thus boasted Saul to have "performed the commandment of God," and stood in it against Samuel; but it was found at length that he had feared the people more than God, in saving those fat oxen for the worship of God which were appointed for destruction. Not much unlike, if not much worse, was that fact of his, who for fear to displease his court and mungrel clergy, with the dissolute of the people, upheld in the church of God, while his power lasted, those beasts of Amalec, the prelates, against the advice of his parliament and the example of all reformation; in this more inexcusable than Saul, that Saul was at length convinced, he to the hour of death fixed in his false persuasion, and sooths himself in the flattering peace of an erroneous and obdurate conscience; singing to his soul vain psalms of exultation, as if the parliament had assailed his reason with the force of arms, and not he on the contrary their reason with his arms; which hath been proved already, and shall be more hereafter.

He twits them with "his Acts of Grace;" proud, and un-self-knowing words in the mouth of any king who affects not to be a God, and such as ought to be as odious in the ears of a free nation. For if they were unjust acts, why did he grant them as of grace? If just, it was not of his grace, but of his duty and his oath to grant them.

"A glorious king he would be, though by his sufferings:" But that can never be to him, whose sufferings are his own doings. He feigns "a hard choice" put upon him, "either to kill his subjects, or be killed." "Yet never was king less in danger of any violence from his subjects, till he unsheathed his sword against them; nay long after that time, when he had spilt the blood of thousands, they had still his person in a foolish veneration.

He complains, "That civil war must be the fruits of his seventeen years reigning with such a measure of justice, peace, plenty, and religion, as all nations either admired or envied." For the justice we had, let the council-table, star-chamber, high-commission speak the praise of it; not forgetting the unprincely usage, and, as far as might be, the abolishing of parliaments, the displacing of honest judges, the sale of offices, bribery and exaction, not found out to be punished, but to be shared in with impunity for the time to come. Who can number the extortions, the oppressions, the publick robberies and rapines committed on the subject both by sea and land under various pretences? their possessions also taken from them, one while as forest-land, another while as crown-land; nor were their goods exempted, no not the bullion in the mint; piracy was become a project owned and authorized against the subject.

For the peace we had, what peace was that which drew out the English to a needless and dishonourable voyage against the Spaniard at Cales? Or that which lent our shipping to a treacherous and antichristian war against the poor protestants of Rochel our suppliants? What peace was that which fell to rob the French by Sea, to the imbarring of all our merchants in that kingdom? which brought forth that unblest expedition to the Isle of Rhee, doubtful whether more calamitous in the success or in the design, betraying all the flower of our military youth and best commanders to a shameful surprisal and execution. This was the peace we had, and the peace we gave, whether to friends or to foes abroad. And if at home any peace was intended us, what meant those billeted foldiers in all parts of the kingdom, and the design of German horse to subdue us in our peaceful houses?

For our religion, where was there a more ignorant, profane, and vitious clergy, learned in nothing but the antiquity of their pride, their covetousness and superstition? whose unsincere and leavenous doctrine, corrupting the people, first taught them looseness, then bondage; loosening them from all sound knowledge and strictness of life, the more to fit them for the bondage of tyranny and superstition. So that what was left us for other nations not to pity rather than admire or envy, all those seventeen years, no wise man could see. For wealth and plenty in a land where justice reigns not, is no argument of a flourishing state, but of a nearness rather to ruin or commotion.

These were not "some miscarriages" only of a government, "which might escape," but a universal distemper, and reducement of law to arbitrary power; not through the evil counsels of "some men," but through the constant course and practice of all that were in highest favour: whose worst actions he frequently avowed and took upon himself, and whose persons when he could no longer protect, he esteemed and favoured to the end; but never otherwise than by constraint, yielding any of them to due punishment; thereby manifesting that what they did, was by his own authority and approbation.

Yet here he asks, "Whose innocent blood he hath shed, what widows or orphans tears can witness against him?" After the suspected poisoning of his father, not enquired into, but smothered up, and him protected and advanced to the very half of his kingdom, who was accused in parliament to be the author of the fact; after so many years of cruel

war

war on his people in three kingdoms. Whence the author of "Truths manifest," a Scotsman, not unacquainted with affairs, positively affirms, "That there hath more christian blood been shed by the commission, approbation, and connivance of King Charles and his father James in the latter end of their reign, than in the ten Roman persecutions. Not to speak of those many whippings, pillories, and other corporal inflictions wherewith his reign also before this war was not unbloody; some have died in prison under cruel restraint, others in banishment, whose lives were shortened through the rigour of that persecution wherewith so many years he infested the true church. And those six members all men judged to have escaped no less than capital danger, whom he so greedily pursuing into the house of commons, had not there the forbearance to conceal how much it troubled him, "That the Birds were flown." If some vulture in the mountains could have opened his beak intelligibly and spoke, what fitter words could he have uttered at the loss of his prey? The tyrant Nero, though not yet deserving that name, set his hand so unwillingly to the execution of a condemned person, as to wish "he had not known letters." Certainly for a king himself to charge his subjects with high treason, and so vehemently to prosecute them in his own cause, as to do the office of a Searcher, argued in him no great aversation from shedding blood, were it but to satisfy his anger, and that revenge was no unpleasing morsel to him, whereof he himself thought not much to be so diligently his own caterer. But we insist rather upon what was actual, than what was probable.

He now falls to examine the causes of this war, as a difficulty which he had long "studied" to find out. "It was not," saith he, "my withdrawing from Whitehall; for no account in reason could be given of those tumults, where an orderly guard was granted." But if it be a most certain truth that the parliament could never yet obtain of him any guard fit to be confided in, then by his own confession some account of those pretended tumults "may in reason be given; and both concerning them and his guards enough hath been said already.

"Whom did he protect against the justice of parliament?" Whom did he not to his utmost power? Endeavouring to have rescued Strafford from their justice, though with the destruction of them and the city; to that end expressly commanding the admittance of new soldiers into the tower, raised by Suckling and other conspirators, under pretence for the Portugal; not to repeat his other plot of bringing up the two armies. But what can be disputed with such a king, in whose mouth and opinion the parliament itself was never but a Faction, and their justice no justice, but "the dictates and overswaying insolence of tumults and rabbles?" and under that excuse avouches himself openly the general patron of most notorious delinquents, and approves their flight out of the land, whose crimes were such, as that the justest and the fairest trial would have soonest condemned them to death. But did not Cataline plead in like manner against the Roman senate, and the injustice of their trial, and the justice of his flight from Rome? Cæsar also, then hatching tyranny, injected the same scrupulous demurs to stop the sentence of death in full and free senate decreed on Lentulus and Cethegus, two of Cataline's accomplices, which were renewed and urged for Strafford. He vouchsafes to the reformation, by both kingdoms intended, no better name than "Innovation and ruin both in church and state." And what we would have learned so gladly of him in other passages before, to know wherein, he tells us now of his own accord. The expelling bishops out of the house of peers, this was "ruin to the state;" the "removing" them "root and branch," this was "ruin to the church." How happy could this nation be in such a governor who counted that their ruin, which they thought their deliverance; the ruin both of church and state, which was the recovery and the saving of them both?

To the passing of those bills against bishops, how is it likely that the house of peers gave so hardly their consent, which they gave so easily before to the attaching them of high treason, twelve at once, only for protesting that the parliament could not act with-

out them? Surely if their rights and privileges were thought so undoubted in that house, as is here maintained; then was that protestation, being meant and intended in the name of their whole spiritual order, no treason; and so that house itself will become liable to a just construction either of injustice in them for so consenting, or of usurpation, representing none but themselves, to expect that their voting or not voting should obstruct the commons: Who not for "five repulses of the Lords," no not for fifty, were to desist from what in the name of the whole kingdom they demanded, so long as those lords were none of our lords. And for the bill against root and branch, though it passed not in both houses till many of the lords and some few of the commons, either enticed away by the king, or overawed by the sense of their own malignancy, not prevailing, deserted the parliament, and made a fair riddance of themselves; that was no warrant for them who remained faithful, being far the greater number, to lay aside that bill of root and branch, till the return of their fugitives; a bill so necessary and so much desired by themselves as by the people.

This was the Partiality, this degrading of the bishops, a thing so wholesome in the state, and so orthodoxal in the church both ancient and reformed, which the king rather than assent to, "will either hazard both his own and the kingdom's ruin," by our just defence against his force of arms; or prostrate our consciences in a blind obedience to himself, and those men, whose superstition, zealous or unzealous, would enforce upon us an antichristian tyranny in the church, neither Primitive, Apostolical, nor more anciently universal than some other manifest corruptions.

But "he was bound, besides his judgment, by a most strict and undispensable oath to preserve that order and the rights of the church." If he mean the oath of his coronation, and that the letter of that oath admit not to be interpreted either by equity, reformation, or better knowledge, then was the king bound by that oath to grant the clergy all those customs, franchises, and canonical privileges granted to them by Edward the Confessor; and so might one day, under pretence of that oath, and his conscience, have brought us all again to popery. But had he so well remembered as he ought, the words to which he swore, he might have found himself no otherwise obliged there, than "according to the laws of God, and true profession of the Gospel." For if those following words, "established in this kingdom," be set there to limit and lay prescription on the laws of God and truth of the gospel by man's establishment, nothing can be more absurd or more injurious to religion. So that however the German emperors or other kings have levied all those wars on their protestant subjects under the colour of a blind and literal observance to an oath, yet this king had least pretence of all. Nor is it to be imagined, if what shall be established come in question, but that the parliament should oversway the king, and not he the parliament. And by all law and reason that which the parliament will not, is no more established in this kingdom, neither is the king bound by oath to uphold it as a thing established.

"Had he gratified," he thinks, "Antiepiscolal faction with his consent, and sacrificed the church-government and revenues to the fury of their covetousness, &c." an army had not been raised. Whereas it was the fury of his own hatred to the professors of true religion which first incited him to prosecute them with the sword of war, when whips, pillories, exiles, and imprisonments were not thought sufficient. To colour which he cannot find wherewithal but that stale pretence of Charles the Vth, and other popish kings, that the protestants had only an intent to lay hands on the church-revenues, a thing never in the thoughts of this parliament, till exhausted by his endless war upon them, their necessity seized on that for the commonwealth, which the luxury of prelates had abused before to a common mischief.

His consent to the unlording of bishops (for to that he himself consented, and at Canterbury the chief seat of their pride, so God would have it) "was from his firm persuasion of their contentedness to suffer a present diminution of their rights." Can any man

man, reading this, not discern the pure mockery of a royal consent, to delude us only for the present, meaning, it seems, when time should serve, to revoke all? By this reckoning, his consents and his denials come all to one pass: and we may hence perceive the wisdom and the integrity of those votes which voted his concessions at the Isle of Wight for grounds of a lasting peace. This he alledges, this controversy about bishops, "to be the true state" of that difference between him and the parliament. For he held episcopacy "both very sacred and divine;" with this judgment, and for this cause he withdrew from the parliament, and confesses that some men knew "he was like to bring again the same judgment which he carried with him." A fair and unexpected justification from his own mouth afforded to the parliament, who notwithstanding what they knew of his obstinate mind, omitted not to use all those means, and that patience to have gained him.

As for delinquents, "he allows them to be but the necessary consequences of his and their withdrawing and defending." A pretty shift! to mince the name of a delinquent into a necessary consequent: what is a traitor, but the necessary consequence of his treason? What a rebel, but of his rebellion? From this conceit he would infer a Pretext only in the parliament "to fetch in delinquents," as if there had indeed been no such cause, but all the delinquency in London Tumults. Which is the over-worn theme, and stuffing of all his discourses.

This he thrice repeats to be the true state and reason of all that war and devastation in the land; and that "of all the treaties and propositions" offered him, he was resolved "never to grant the abolishing of episcopal, or the establishment of presbyterian government." I would demand now of the Scots and covenanters (for so I call them, as mis-observers of the covenant) how they will reconcile "the preservation of religion and their liberties, and the bringing of delinquents to condign punishment," with the freedom, honour, and safety of this vowed resolution here, that esteems all the zeal of their prostituted covenant no better than "a noise and shew of piety, a heat for reformation, filling them with prejudice, and obstructing all equality and clearness of judgment in them." With these principles who knows but that at length he might have come to take the covenant, as others whom they brotherly admit, have done before him? And then all, no doubt, had gone well, and ended in a happy peace.

His prayer is most of it borrowed out of David; but what if it be answered him as the Jews, who trusted in Moses, were answered by our Saviour; "there is one that accuseth you, even David, whom you misapply."

He tells God, "that his enemies are many," but tells the people, when it serves his turn, they are but "a faction of some few, prevailing over the major part of both houses."

"God knows he had no passion, design or preparation to embroil his kingdom in a civil war." True; for he thought his kingdom to be Issachar, a "strong ass that would have couched down between two burdens," the one of prelatical superstition, the other of civil tyranny: but what passion and design, what close and open preparation he had made to subdue us to both these by terror and preventive force, all the nation knows.

"The confidence of some men had almost persuaded him to suspect his own innocence." As the words of Saint Paul had almost persuaded Agrippa to be a christian. But almost in the work of repentance, is as good as not at all.

"God, saith he, will find out bloody and deceitful men, many of whom have not lived out half their days." It behoved him to have been more cautious how he tempted God's finding out of blood and deceit, till his own years had been further spent, or that he had enjoyed longer "the fruits of his own violent counsels."

But instead of wariness he adds another temptation, charging God "to know that the chief design of this war was either to destroy his person, or to force his judgment." And thus his prayer from the evil practice of unjust accusing men to God, arises to the

hideous rashness of accusing God before men, to know that for truth, which all men know to be most false.

He prays, "that God would forgive the people, for they know not what they do." It is an easy matter to say over what our Saviour said; but how he loved the people, other arguments than affected sayings must demonstrate. He who so oft hath presumed rashly to appeal to the knowledge and testimony of God in things so evidently untrue, may be doubted what belief or esteem he had of his forgiveness, either to himself, or those for whom he would so feign that men should hear he prayed.

X. Upon their seizing the magazines, forts, &c.

TO put the matter soonest out of controversy who was the first beginner of this civil war, since the beginning of all war may be discerned not only by the first act of hostility, but by the counsels and preparations foregoing, it shall evidently appear that the king was still foremost in all these. No king had ever at his first coming to the crown more love and acclamation from a people; never any people found worse requital of their loyalty and good affection: First, by his extraordinary fear and mistrust that their liberties and rights were the impairing and diminishing of his regal power, the true original of tyranny; next, by his hatred to all those who were esteemed religious; doubting that their principles too much asserted liberty. This was quickly seen by the vehemence, and the causes alledged of his persecuting, the other by his frequent and opprobrious dissolution of parliaments; after he had demanded more money of them, and they to obtain their rights had granted him, than would have bought the Turk out of Morea, and set free all the Greeks. But when he sought to extort from us, by way of tribute, that which had been offered him conditionally in parliament, as by a free people, and that those extortions were now consumed and wasted by the luxury of his court, he began then (for still the more he did wrong, the more he feared) before any tumult or insurrection of the people, to take counsel how he might totally subdue them to his own will. Then was the design of German horse, and soldiers billeted in all parts; the pulpits resounded with no other doctrine than that which gave all property to the king, and passive obedience to the subject. After which innumerable forms and shapes of new exactions and exacters overspread the land: Nor was it enough to be impoverished, unless we were disarmed. Our trained-bands, which are the trustiest and most proper strength of a free nation, had their arms in divers counties taken from them; other ammunition by design was ingrossed and kept in the tower, not to be bought without a licence, and at a high rate.

Thus far, and many other ways were his counsels and preparations before-hand with us, either to a civil war, if it should happen, or to subdue us without a war, which is all one, until the raising of his two armies against the Scots, and the latter of them raised to the most perfidious breaking of a solemn pacification.

After the beginning of this parliament, whom he saw so resolute and unanimous to relieve the commonwealth, and that the earl of Strafford was condemned to die, other of his evil counsellors impeached and imprisoned, to shew there wanted not evil counsel within himself sufficient to begin a war upon his subjects, though no way by them provoked, he sends an agent with letters to the king of Denmark, requiring aid against the parliament, endeavours to bring up both armies, first the English, with whom 8000 Irish papists raised by Strafford, and a French army were to join; then the Scots at Newcastle, whom he thought to have encouraged by telling them what money and horse he was to have from Denmark. I mention not the Irish conspiracy till due place. These and many other were his counsels toward a civil war. His preparations, after those two armies were dismissed, could not suddenly be too open: Nevertheless there were 8000 Irish papists which he refused to disband, though intreated by both houses, first, for reasons

sons best known to himself, next, under pretence of lending them to the Spaniard; and so kept them undisbanded till very near the month wherein that rebellion broke forth. He was also raising forces in London, pretendedly to serve the Portugal, but with intent to seize the tower. Into which divers canoneers were by him sent; the court was fortified with ammunition, and soldiers new listed, who followed the king from London, and appeared at Kingston some hundreds of horse in a warlike manner, with waggons of ammunition after them; the queen in Holland was buying more; the inhabitants of Yorkshire and other counties were called to arms, and actual forces raised, while the parliament were yet petitioning in peace.

As to the act of hostility, though not much material in whom first it began, after such counsels and preparations discovered, and so far advanced by the king, yet in that act also he will be found to have had precedency, if not at London by the assault of his armed court upon the naked people, and his attempt upon the house of commons, yet certainly at Hull, first by his close practices on that town, next by his siege. Thus whether counsels, preparations, or acts of hostility be considered, it appears with evidence enough, though much more might be said, that the king is truly charged to be the first beginner of these civil wars. To which may be added as a close, that in the Isle of Wight he charged it upon himself at the public treaty, and acquitted the parliament.

But as for the securing of Hull and the public stores therein, and in other places, it was no "surprisal of his strength;" the custody whereof by authority of parliament was committed into hands most fit and most responsible for such a trust. It were a folly beyond ridiculous, to count ourselves a free nation, if the king, not in parliament, but in his own person, and against them, might appropriate to himself the strength of a whole nation as his proper goods. What the laws of the land are, a parliament should know best, having both the life and death of laws in their law-giving power: And the law of England is, at best, but the reason of parliament. The parliament therefore, taking into their hands that whereof most properly they ought to have the keeping, committed no surprisal. If they prevented him, that argued not at all either "his innocency or unpreparedness," but their timely foresight to use prevention.

But what needed that? "They knew his chiefest arms left him were those only which the ancient christians were wont to use against their persecutors, prayers and tears." O sacred reverence of God, respect and shame of men, whither were ye fled, when these hypocrisies were uttered? Was the kingdom then at all that cost of blood, to remove from him none but prayers and tears? What were those thousands of blaspheming cavaliers about him, whose mouths let fly oaths and curses by the volley; were those the prayers? and those carouses drunk to the confusion of all things good or holy, did those minister the tears? Were they prayers and tears that were listed at York, mustered on Heworth moore, and laid siege to Hull for the guard of his person? Were prayers and tears at so high a rate in Holland, that nothing could purchase them but the crown-jewels? Yet they in Holland (such word was sent us) sold them for guns, carabines, mortar-pieces, cannons, and other deadly instruments of war; which when they came to York, were all no doubt by the merit of some great saint suddenly transformed into prayers and tears; and being divided into regiments and brigades, were the only arms that mischieved us in all those battles and encounters.

These were his chief arms, whatever we must call them, and yet such arms, as they who fought for the commonwealth, have by the help of better prayers vanquished and brought to nothing.

He bewails his want of the militia, "not so much in reference to his own protection, as the people's, whose many and sore oppressions grieve him." Never considering how ill for seventeen years together he had protected them, and that these miseries of the people are still his own handy-work, having smitten them like a forked arrow, so fore
into

into the kingdom's sides, as not to be drawn out and cured without the incision of more flesh.

He tells us that "what he wants in the hands of power," he has in "the wings of faith and prayer." But they who made no reckoning of those wings while they had that power in their hands, may easily mistake the wings of faith for the wings of presumption, and so fall headlong.

We meet next with a comparison, how apt let them judge that have travelled to Mecca, "that the parliament have hung the majesty of kingship in an airy imagination of regality, between the privileges of both houses, like the tomb of Mahomet." He knew not that he was prophesying the death and burial of a Turkish tyranny, that spurned down those laws which gave it life and being, so long as it endured to be a regulated monarchy.

He counts it an injury "not to have the sole power in himself to help or hurt any;" and that the "militia, which he holds to be his undoubted right, should be disposed as the parliament thinks fit:" And yet confesses that if he had it in his actual disposing, he would defend those whom he calls "his good subjects from those men's violence and fraud, who would persuade the world that none but wolves are fit to be trusted with the custody of the shepherd and his flock." Surely, if we may guess whom he means here, by knowing whom he hath ever most opposed in this controversy, we may then assure ourselves that by violence and fraud he means that which the parliament hath done in settling the militia, and those the wolves, into whose hands it was by them intrusted: which draws a clear confession from his own mouth, that if the parliament had left him sole power of the Militia, he would have used it to the destruction of them and their friends.

As for the sole power of the Militia, which he claims as a right no less undoubted than the crown, it hath been oft enough told him, that he hath no more authority over the sword than over the law; over the law he hath none, either to establish or to abrogate, to interpret or to execute, but only by his courts and in his courts, whereof the parliament is highest: no more therefore hath he power of the Militia, which is the sword, either to use or to dispose, but with consent of parliament; give him but that, and as good give him all our laws and liberties. For if the power of the sword were any where separate and undepending from the power of law, which is originally seated in the highest court, then were that power of the sword higher than the power of law, and being at one man's disposal, might, when he pleased, controul the law, and enslave us. Such power as this did the king in open terms challenge to have over us, and brought thousands to help him win it; so much more good at fighting than at understanding, as to persuade themselves that they fought then for the subject's liberty.

He is contented, because he knows no other remedy, to resign this power "for his own time, but not for his successors:" So diligent and careful he is that we should be slaves, if not to him, yet to his posterity, and fain would leave us the legacy of another war about it. But the parliament have done well to remove that question: whom, as his manner is to dignify with some good name or other, he calls now a "many-headed hydra of government, full of factious distractions, and not more eyes than mouths." Yet surely not more mouths, or not so wide as the dissolute rabble of all his courtiers had, both hees and shees, if there were any males among them.

He would prove that to govern by parliament hath "a monstrosity rather than perfection;" and grounds his argument upon two or three eminent absurdities: First, by placing counsel in the senses, next, by turning the senses out of the head, and in lieu thereof placing power, supreme above sense and reason; which be now the greater monstrosities? Further to dispute what kind of government is best, would be a long theme; it sufficeth that his reasons here for monarchy are found weak and inconsiderable.

He

He bodes much "horror and bad influence after his eclipse." He speaks his wishes; but they who by weighing prudently things past, foresee things to come, the best divination, may hope rather all good success and happiness, by removing that darkness, which the misty cloud of his prerogative made between us and a peaceful reformation, which is our true sun-light, and not he, though he would be taken for our sun itself. And wherefore should we not hope to be governed more happily without a king, whenas all our misery and trouble hath been either by a king, or by our necessary vindication and defence against him?

He would be thought "inforced to perjury," by having granted the militia, by which his oath bound him to protect the people. If he can be perjured in granting that, why doth he refuse for no other cause the abolishing of episcopacy? But never was any oath so blind as to swear him to protect delinquents against justice, but to protect all the people in that order, and by those hands which the parliament should advise him to, and the protected confide in; and not under the shew of protection to hold a violent and incommunicable sword over us, as ready to be let fall upon our own necks, as upon our enemies; nor to make our own hands and weapons fight against our own liberties.

By his parting with the Militia he takes to himself much praise of his "assurance in God's protection;" and to the parliament imputes the fear "of not daring to adventure the injustice of their actions upon any other way of safety." But wherefore came not this assurance of God's protection to him, till the Militia was wrung out of his hands? It should seem by his holding it so fast, that his own actions and intentions had no less of injustice in them, than what he charges upon others, whom he terms Chaldeans, Sabeans, and the devil himself. But Job used no such Militia against those enemies, nor such a magazine as was at Hull, which this king so contended for, and made war upon us, that he might have wherewithal to make war against us.

He concludes, that "although they take all from him, yet can they not obstruct his way to heaven." It was no handsome occasion, by feigning obstructions where they are not, to tell us whither he was going: he should have shut the door, and prayed in secret, not here in the high street. Private prayers in public, ask something of whom they ask not, and that shall be their reward.

XI. Upon the Nineteen Propositions, &c.

OF the nineteen propositions he names none in particular, neither shall the answer: But he insists upon the old plea of "his conscience, honour and reason;" using the plausibility of large and indefinite words, to defend himself at such a distance as may hinder the eye of common judgment from all distinct view and examination of his reasoning. "He would buy the peace of his people at any rate, save only the parting with his conscience and honour." Yet shews not how it can happen that the peace of a people, if otherwise to be bought at any rate, should be inconsistent or at variance with the conscience and honour of a king. Till then, we may receive it for a better sentence, that nothing should be more agreeable to the conscience and honour of a king, than to preserve his subjects in peace, especially from civil war.

And which of the propositions were "obtruded on him with the point of the sword," till he first with the point of the sword thrust from him both the propositions and the propounders? He never reckons those violent and merciless obtrusions, which for almost twenty years he had been forcing upon tender consciences by all sorts of persecution, till through the multitude of them that were to suffer, it could be no more called a persecution, but a plain war. From which when first the Scots, then the English, were constrained to defend themselves, this their just defence is that which he calls here, "their making war upon his soul."

He grudges that "so many things are required of him, and nothing offered him in requital of those favours which he had granted." What could satiate the desires of this man, who being king of England, and master of almost two millions yearly, was still in want; and those acts of justice which he was to do in duty, counts done as favours; and such favours as were not done without the avaritious hopes of other rewards besides supreme honour, and the constant revenue of his place?

"This honour," he saith, "they did him, to put him on the giving part." And spake truer than he intended, it being meerly for honour's sake that they did so; not that it belonged to him of right: for what can he give to a parliament, who receives all he hath from the people, and for the people's good? Yet now he brings his own conditional rights to contest and be preferred before the people's good; and yet unless it be in order to their good, he hath no rights at all; reigning by the laws of the land, not by his own; which laws are in the hands of parliament to change or abrogate as they shall see best for the commonwealth; even to the taking away of kingship itself, when it grows too masterful and burdensome. For every commonwealth is in general defined, a society sufficient of itself, in all things conducive to well-being and commodious life. Any of which requisite things, if it cannot have without the gift and favour of a single person, or without leave of his private reason or his conscience, it cannot be thought sufficient of itself, and by consequence no commonwealth, nor free; but a multitude of vassals in the possession and domain of one absolute lord, and wholly obnoxious to his will. If the king have power to give or deny any thing to his parliament, he must do it either as a person severall from them, or as one greater; neither of which will be allowed him: not to be considered severally from them; for as the kings of England can do no wrong, so neither can he do right but in his courts and by his courts; and what is legally done in them, shall be deemed the king's assent, though he as a severall person shall judge or endeavour the contrary: so that indeed without his courts, or against them, he is no king. If therefore he obtrude upon us any public mischief, or withhold from us any general good, which is wrong in the highest degree, he must do it as a tyrant, not as a king of England, by the known maxims of our law. Neither can he, as one greater, give aught to the parliament which is not in their own power, but he must be greater also than the kingdom which they represent: so that to honour him with the giving part was a meer civility, and may be well termed the courtesy of England, not the king's due.

But the "incommunicable jewel of his conscience" he will not give, "but reserve to himself." It seems that his conscience was none of the crown-jewels; for those we know were in Holland, not incommunicable to buy arms against his subjects. Being therefore but a private jewel, he could not have done a greater pleasure to the kingdom than by reserving it to himself. But he, contrary to what is here professed, would have his conscience not an incommunicable, but a universal conscience, the whole kingdom's conscience. Thus what he seems to fear lest we should ravish from him, is our chief complaint that he obtruded upon us; we never forced him to part with his conscience, but it was he that would have forced us to part with ours.

Some things he taxes them to have offered him, "which while he had the mastery of his reason, he would never consent to." Very likely; but had his reason mastered him as it ought, and not been mastered long ago by his sense and humour (as the breeding of most kings hath been ever sensual and most humoured) perhaps he would have made no difficulty. Mean while at what a fine pass is the kingdom, that must depend in greatest exigencies upon the fantasy of a king's reason, be he wise or fool, who arrogantly shall answer all the wisdom of the land, that what they offer seems to him unreasonable?

He prefers his "love of truth" before his love of the people. His love of truth would have led him to the search of truth, and have taught him not to lean so much upon his own understanding. He met at first with doctrines of unaccountable prerogative; in them he rested, because they pleased him; they therefore pleased him because they

gave him all: and this he calls his love of truth, and prefers it before love of his people's peace.

Some things they proposed "which would have wounded the inward peace of his conscience." The more our evil hap, that three kingdoms should be thus pestered with one conscience; who chiefly scrupled to grant us that which the parliament advised him to, as the chief means of our public welfare and reformation. These scruples to many perhaps seem pretended; to others, upon as good grounds, may seem real; and that it was the just judgment of God, that he who was so cruel and so remorseless to other men's consciences, should have a conscience within him as cruel to himself; constraining him, as he constrained others, and insnaring him by such ways and counsels as were certain to be his destruction.

"Other things he could approve, yet in honour and policy he thought fit to deny, lest he should seem to dare deny nothing." By this means he will be sure, what with reason, honour, policy, or punctilio's, to be found never unfurnished of a denial: whether it were his envy not to be overbounteous, or that the submissiveness of our asking stirred up in him a certain pleasure of denying. Good princes have thought it their chief happiness to be always granting; if good things, for the things sake; if things indifferent, for the people's sake, while this man sits calculating variety of excuses how he may grant least, as if his whole strength and royalty were placed in a meer negative.

Of one proposition especially he laments him much, that they would bind him "to a general and implicit consent for whatever they desired." Which though I find not among the nineteen, yet undoubtedly the oath of his coronation binds him to no less; neither is he at all by his office to interpose against a parliament in the making or not making of any law; but to take that for just and good legally, which is there decreed, and to see it executed accordingly. Nor was he set over us to vie wisdom with his parliament, but to be guided by them: any of whom possibly may as far excel him in the gift of wisdom, as he them in place and dignity. But much nearer is it to impossibility that any king alone should be wiser than all his council; sure enough it was not he, though no king ever before him so much contended to have it thought so. And if the parliament so thought not, but desired him to follow their advice and deliberation in things of public concernment, he accounts it the same proposition, as if Sampson had been moved "to the putting out his eyes, that the Philistines might abuse him." And thus out of an unwise and pretended fear, lest others should make a scorn of him for yielding to his parliament, he regards not to give cause of worse suspicion that he made a scorn of his regal oath.

But "to exclude him from all power of denial seems an arrogance;" in the parliament he means: what in him then to deny against the parliament? None at all, by what he argues: for "by petitioning, they confess their inferiority, and that obliges them to rest, if not satisfied, yet quieted with such an answer as the will and reason of their superior thinks fit to give." First, petitioning, in better English, is no more than requesting or requiring; and men require not favours only, but their due, and that not only from superiors, but from equals, and inferiors also. The noblest Romans, when they stood for that which was a kind of regal honour, the consulship, were wont in a submissive manner to go about, and beg that highest dignity of the meanest Plebeians, naming them man by man; which in their tongue was called *Petitio consulatus*. And the parliament of England petitioned the king, not because all of them were inferior to him, but because he was inferior to any one of them, which they did of civil custom, and for fashion's sake more than of duty; for by plain law cited before, the parliament is his superior.

But what law in any trial or dispute enjoins a freeman to rest quieted, though not satisfied with the will and reason of his superior? It were a mad law that would subject reason to superiority of place. And if our highest consultations and purposed laws must be terminated by the king's will, then is the will of one man our law, and no subtlety of dispute can redeem the parliament and nation from being slaves: neither can any tyrant re-

quire more than that his will or reason, though not satisfying, should yet be rested in, and determine all things. We may conclude therefore, that when the parliament petitioned the king, it was but merely form, let it be as "foolish and absurd" as he pleases. It cannot certainly be so absurd as what he requires, that the parliament should confine their own and all the kingdom's reason to the will of one man, because it was his hap to succeed his father. For neither God nor the laws have subjected us to his will, nor set his reason to be our sovereign above law (which must needs be, if he can strangle it in the birth) but set his person over us in the sovereign execution of such laws as the parliament establish. The parliament therefore, without any usurpation, hath had always in their power to limit and confine the exorbitancy of kings, whether they call it their will, their reason, or their conscience.

But this above all was never expected, nor is to be indured, that a king, who is bound by law and oath to follow the advice of his parliament, should be permitted to except against them as "young Statesmen," and proudly to suspend his following their advice, "until his seven years experience had shewn him how well they could govern themselves." Doubtless the law never supposed so great an arrogance could be in one man; that he whose seventeen years unexperience had almost ruined all, should sit another seven years schoolmaster, to tutor those who were sent by the whole realm to be his counsellors and teachers. And with what modesty can he pretend to be a statesman himself; who with his father's king-craft and his own, did never that of his own accord which was not directly opposite to his professed interest both at home and abroad; discontenting and alienating his subjects at home, weakning and deserting his confederates abroad, and with them the common cause of religion; so that the whole course of his reign, by an example of his own furnishing, hath resembled Phaeton more than Phœbus, and forced the parliament to drive like Jehu; which Omen taken from his own mouth, God hath not diverted?

And he on the other side might have remembered that the parliament sit in that body, not as his subjects, but as his superiors, called, not by him, but by the law; not only twice every year, but as oft as great affairs require, to be his counsellors and dictators, though he stomach it; nor to be dissolved at his pleasure, but when all grievances be first removed, all petitions heard and answered. This is not only reason, but the known law of the land.

"When he heard that propositions would be sent him," he sat conjecturing what they would propound; and because they propounded what he expected not, he takes that to be a warrant for his denying them. But what did he expect? He expected that the parliament would reinforce "some old laws." But if those laws were not a sufficient remedy to all grievances, nay were found to be grievances themselves, when did we lose that other part of our freedom to establish new? He thought "some injuries done by himself and others to the commonwealth were to be repaired." But how could that be, while he the chief offender took upon him to be sole judge both of the injury and the reparation? "He staid till the advantage of his crown considered, might induce him to condescend to the people's good." Whenas the crown itself with all those advantages were therefore given him, that the people's good should be first considered; not bargained for, and bought by inches with the bribe of more offertures and advantages to his crown. He looked "for moderate desires of due reformation;" as if any such desires could be immoderate. He looked for such a reformation "both in Church and State, as might preserve" the roots of every grievance and abuse in both still growing (which he calls "the foundations and essentials") and would have only the excrescencies of evil pruned away for the present, as was plotted before, that they might grow fast enough between triennial parliaments to hinder them by work enough besides from ever striking at the root. He alledges, "They should have had regard to the laws in force, to the wisdom and piety of former parliaments, to the ancient and universal practice of christian churches." As if they who come with full authority

city to redress public grievances, which oft-times are laws themselves, were to have their hands bound by laws in force, or the supposition of more piety and wisdom in their ancestors, or the practice of churches heretofore; whose fathers, notwithstanding all these pretences, made as vast alterations to free themselves from ancient popery. For all antiquity that adds or varies from the scripture is no more warranted to our safe imitation, than what was done the age before at Trent. Nor was there need to have despaired of what could be established in lieu of what was to be annulled, having before his eyes the government of so many churches beyond the seas; whose pregnant and solid reasons wrought so with the parliament, as to desire a uniformity rather with all other protestants, than to be a schism divided from them under a conclave of thirty bishops, and a crew of irreligious priests that gaped for the same preferment.

And whereas he blames those propositions for not containing what they ought, what did they mention, but to vindicate and restore the rights of parliament invaded by cabin councils, the courts of justice obstructed, and the government of church innovated and corrupted? All these things he might easily have observed in them, which he affirms he could not find; but found "those demanding" in parliament who were "lookt upon before as factious in the state, and schismatical in the church; and demanding not only toleration for themselves in their vanity, novelty, and confusion, but also an extirpation of that government whose rights they had a mind to invade." Was this man ever likely to be advised, who with such a prejudice and disesteem sets himself against his chosen and appointed counsellors? likely ever to admit of reformation, who censures all the government of other protestant churches as bad as any papist could have censured them? And what king had ever his whole kingdom in such contempt, so to wrong and dishonour the free elections of his people, as to judge them whom the nation thought worthiest to sit with him in parliament, few else but such as were "punishable by the laws:" yet knowing that time was, when to be a protestant, to be a christian, was by law as punishable as to be a traitor; and that our Saviour himself coming to reform his church, was accused of an intent to invade Cæsar's right, as good a right as the prelate bishops ever had; the one being got by force, the other by spiritual usurpation, and both by force upheld?

He admires and falls into an extasy that the parliament should send him such a "horrid proposition," as the removal of episcopacy. But expect from him in an extasy no other reasons of his admiration than the dream and tautology of what he hath so oft repeated, law, antiquity, ancestors, prosperity, and the like, which will be therefore not worth a second answer, but may pass with his own comparison, into the common sewer of other popish arguments.

"Had the two houses sued out their livery from the wardship of tumults," he could sooner have believed them. It concerned them first to sue out their livery from the unjust wardship of his encroaching prerogative. And had he also redeemed his overdated minority from a pupilage under bishops, he would much less have mistrusted his parliament; and never would have set so base a character upon them, as to count them no better than the vassals of certain nameless men, whom he charges to be such as "hunt after faction with their hounds the tumults." And yet the bishops could have told him, that Nimrod, the first that hunted after faction, is reputed by ancient tradition the first that founded monarchy; whence it appears that to hunt after faction is more properly the king's game, and those hounds, which he calls the vulgar, have been often halloo'd to from court, of whom the mungrel sort have been inticed; the rest have not lost their scent, but understood aright that the parliament had that part to act which he had failed in; that trust to discharge, which he had broken; that estate and honour to preserve, which was far beyond his, the estate and honour of the commonwealth, which he had imbezzled.

Yet so far doth self-opinion or false principles delude and transport him, as to think "the concurrence of his reason" to the votes of parliament, not only political, but natural,

ral, "and as necessary to the begetting," or bringing forth of any one "compleat act of public wisdom as the sun's influence is necessary to all nature's productions." So that the parliament, it seems, is but a female, and without his procreative reason can produce no law: wisdom, it seems, to a king is natural, to a parliament not natural, but by conjunction with the king: yet he professes to hold his kingly right by law; and if no law could be made but by the great council of a nation, which we now term a parliament, then certainly it was a parliament that first created kings; and not only made laws before a king was in being, but those laws especially whereby he holds his crown. He ought then to have so thought of a parliament, if he count it not male, as of his mother, which to civil being created both him and the royalty he wore. And if it hath been anciently interpreted the presaging sign of a future tyrant, but to dream of copulation with his mother, what can it be less than actual tyranny to affirm waking, that the parliament, which is his mother, can neither conceive or bring forth "any authoritative act" without his masculine coition? Nay, that his reason is as celestial and life-giving to the parliament, as the sun's influence is to the earth: what other notions but these or such like, could swell up Caligula to think himself a God?

But to be rid of these mortifying propositions, he leaves tyrannical evasion unessay'd; first, "that they are not the joint and free desires of both houses, or the major part;" next, "that the choice of many members was carried on by faction." The former of these is already discovered to be an old device put first in practice by Charles the Fifth, since reformation: who when the protestants of Germany for their own defence joined themselves in a league, in his declarations and remonstrances laid the fault only upon some few (for it was dangerous to take notice of too many enemies) and accused them that under colour of religion they had a purpose to invade his and the church's right; by which policy he deceived many of the German cities, and kept them divided from that league, until they saw themselves brought into a snare. That other cavil against the people's choice puts us in mind rather what the court was wont to do, and how to tamper with elections: neither was there at that time any faction more potent, or more likely to do such a business, than they themselves who complain most.

But "he must chew such morsels, as propositions, ere he let them down." So let him; but if the kingdom shall taste nothing but after his chewing, what does he make of the kingdom, but a great baby? "The straightness of his conscience will not give him leave to swallow down such camels of sacrilege and injustice as others do." This is the pharisee up and down, "I am not as other men are." But what camels of injustice he could devour, all his three realms were witness, which was the cause that they almost perished for want of parliaments. And he that will be unjust to man, will be sacrilegious to God; and to bereave a christian conscience of liberty for no other reason than the narrowness of his own conscience, is the most unjust measure to man, and the worst sacrilege to God. That other, which he calls sacrilege, of taking from the clergy that superfluous wealth, which antiquity as old as Constantine, from the credit of a divine vision, counted "poison in the church," hath been ever most opposed by men whose righteousness in other matters hath been least observed. He concludes, as his manner is, with high commendation of his own "unbiaffed rectitude," and believes nothing to be in them that dissent from him, but faction, innovation, and particular designs. Of these repetitions I find no end, no not in his prayer; which being founded upon deceitful principles, and a fond hope that God will bless him in those "his errors, which he calls "honest," finds a fit answer of St. James, "Ye ask and receive not, because ye ask amiss." As for the truth and sincerity which he prays may be always found in those his declarations to the people, the contrariety of his own actions will bear eternal witness, how little careful or solicitous he was, what he promised or what he uttered there.

XII. Upon the Rebellion in Ireland.

TH E rebellion and horrid massacre of English protestants in Ireland, to the number of 154000 by their own computation, although so sudden and so violent, as at first to amaze all men that were not accessory; yet from whom, and from what counsels it first sprung, neither was, nor could be possibly so secret, as the contrivers thereof, blinded with vain hope, or the despair that other plots would succeed, supposed: for it cannot be imaginable that the Irish, guided by so many subtle and Italian heads of the Romish party, should so far have lost the use of reason, and indeed of common sense, as not supported with other strength than their own, to begin a war so desperate and irreconcilable against both England and Scotland at once. All other nations; from whom they could expect aid, were busied to the utmost in their own most necessary concerns. It remains then that either some authority, or some great assistance promised them from England, was that whereon they chiefly trusted. And as it is not difficult to discern from what inducing cause this insurrection first arose, so neither was it hard at first to have applied some effectual Remedy, though not prevention. But the assurance which they had in private, that no remedy should be applied, was it seems, one of the chief reasons that drew on their undertaking.

Seeing then the main incitement and authority for this rebellion must be needs derived from England, it will be next inquired, who was the prime author. The king here denounces a malediction temporal and eternal, not simply to the author, but to the "malicious author" of this bloodshed: and by that limitation may exempt, not himself only, but perhaps the Irish rebels themselves, who never will confess to God or man that any blood was shed by them maliciously; but either in the catholic cause, or common liberty, or some other specious plea, which the conscience from grounds both good and evil usually suggests to itself: thereby thinking to elude the direct force of that imputation which lies upon them.

Yet he acknowledges "it fell out as a most unhappy advantage of some mens malice against him:" but indeed of most mens just suspicion, by finding in it no such wide departure or disagreement from the scope of his former counsels and proceedings. And that he himself was the author of that rebellion, he denies both here and elsewhere, with many imprecations, but no solid evidence: What on the other side against his denial hath been affirmed in three kingdoms, being here briefly set in view, the reader may so judge as he finds cause.

This is most certain, that the king was ever friendly to the Irish papists, and in his third year, against the plain advice of parliament, like a kind of pope, sold them many indulgences for money; and upon all occasions advancing the popish party, and negotiating under-hand by priests, who were made his agents, engaged the Irish papists in a war against the Scots protestants. To that end he furnished them, and had them trained in arms, and kept them up the only army in his three kingdoms, till the very burst of that rebellion. The summer before that dismal October, a committee of most active papists, all since in the head of that rebellion, were in great favour at Whitehall; and admitted to many private consultations with the king and queen. And to make it evident that no mean matters were the subject of those conferences, at their request he gave away his peculiar right to more than five Irish counties, for the payment of an inconsiderable rent. They departed not home till within two months before the rebellion; and were either from the first breaking out, or soon after, found to be the chief rebels themselves. But what should move the king, besides his own inclination to popery, and the prevalence of his queen over him, to hold such frequent and close meetings with a committee of Irish papists in his own house, while the parliament of England sat unadvised with, is declared by a Scots author, and of itself is clear enough. The parliament at the beginning
of

of that summer, having put Strafford to death, imprisoned others his chief favourites, and driven the rest to fly; the king, who had in vain tempted both the Scots and the English army to come up against the parliament and city, finding no compliance answerable to his hope from the protestant armies, betakes himself last to the Irish, who had in readiness an army of eight thousand papists, and a committee here of the same religion. And with them, who thought the time now come to do eminent service for the church of Rome against a puritan parliament, he concludes that so soon as both armies in England should be disbanded, the Irish should appear in arms, master all the protestants, and help the king against his parliament. And we need not doubt that those five counties were given to the Irish for other reason than the four northern counties had been a little before offered to the Scots. The king in August takes a journey into Scotland; and overtaking the Scots army then on their way home, attempts the second time to pervert them, but without success. No sooner come into Scotland, but he lays a plot, so saith the Scots author, to remove out of the way such of the nobility there, as were most likely to withstand, or not to further his designs. This being discovered, he sends from his side one Dillon a papist Lord, soon after a chief rebel, with letters into Ireland; and dispatches a commission under the great seal of Scotland at that time in his own custody, commanding that they should forthwith, as had been formerly agreed, cause all the Irish to rise in arms. Who no sooner had received such command, but obeyed; and began in massacre, for they knew no other way to make sure the protestants, which was commanded them expressly; and the way, it seems, left to their discretion. He who hath a mind to read the commission itself, and sound reason added why it was not likely to be forged, besides the attestation of so many Irish themselves, may have recourse to a book, intitled, "The Mystery of Iniquity."

After the rebellion broken out, which in words only he detested, but underhand favoured and promoted by all the offices of friendship, correspondence, and what possible aid he could afford them, the particulars whereof are too many to be inserted here, I suppose no understanding man could longer doubt who was "Author or Instigator" of that rebellion. If there be who yet doubt, I refer them especially to that declaration of July 1643, concerning this matter. Against which testimonies, likelihoods, evidences, and apparent actions of his own, being so abundant, the bare denial of one man, though with imprecation, cannot in any reason countervail.

As for the commission granted them, he thinks to evade that by retorting, that "some in England fight against him," and yet "pretend his authority." But though a parliament by the known laws may affirm justly to have the king's authority inseparable from that court, though divided from his person, it is not credible that the Irish rebels who so much tendered his person above his authority, and were by him so well received at Oxford, would be so far from all humanity, as to slander him with a particular commission, signed and sent them by his own hand.

And of his good affection to the rebels, this chapter itself is not without witness. He holds them less in fault than the Scots, as from whom they might alledge to have fetched "their imitation;" making no difference between men that rose necessarily to defend themselves, which no protestant doctrine ever disallowed, against them who threatened war, and those who began a voluntary and causeless rebellion with the massacre of so many thousands who never meant them harm.

He falls next to flashes, and a multitude of words, in all which is contained no more, than what might be the plea of any guiltiest offender: He was not the author, because "he hath the greatest share of loss and dishonour by what is committed." Who is there that offends God, or his neighbour, on whom the greatest share of loss and dishonour lights not in the end? But in the act of doing evil, men use not to consider the event of their evil doing; or if they do, have they no power to curb the sway of their own wickedness: so that the greatest share of loss and dishonour to happen upon themselves, is no argument

ment that they were not guilty. This other is as weak, that "a King's Interest above that of any other man, "lies chiefly in the common welfare of his subjects;" therefore no king will do aught against the common welfare. For by this evasion any tyrant might as well purge himself from the guilt of raising troubles or commotions among the people, because undoubtedly his chief interest lies in their sitting still.

I said but now that even this chapter, if nothing else, might suffice to discover his good affection to the rebels; which in this that follows too notoriously appears; inputting this insurrection to "the preposterous rigour, and unreasonable severity, the covetous zeal and uncharitable fury of some men," (these "some men" by his continual paraphrase are meant the parliament;) and lastly, "to the fear of utter extirpation." If the whole Irishry of rebels had fee'd some advocate to speak partially and sophistically in their defence, he could have hardly dazled better: yet nevertheless would have proved himself no other than a plausible deceiver. And perhaps those feigned terrors and jealousies were either by the king himself, or the popish priests which were sent by him, put into the head of that inquisitive people, on set purpose to engage them. For who had power "to oppress" them, or to relieve them being oppressed, but the king, or his immediate deputy? This rather should have made them rise against the king, than against the parliament. Who threatned or ever thought of their extirpation, till they themselves had begun it to the English? As for "preposterous rigour, covetous zeal, and uncharitable fury;" they had more reason to suspect those evils first from his own commands, whom they saw using daily no greater argument to prove the truth of his religion than by enduring no other but his own Prelatical; and to force it upon others, made episcopal, ceremonial, and common-prayer-book wars. But the papists understood him better than by the outside; and knew that those wars were their wars. Although if the commonwealth should be afraid to suppress open idolatry, lest the papists thereupon should grow desperate, this were to let them grow and become our persecutors, while we neglected what we might have done evangelically, to be their reformers: Or to do as his father James did, who instead of taking heart and putting confidence in God by such a deliverance as from the powder-plot, though it went not off, yet with the meer conceit of it, as some observe, was hit into such a hectic trembling between protestant and papist all his life after, as that he never durst from that time do otherwise than equivocate or colloque with the pope and his adherents.

He would be thought to commiserate the sad effects of that rebellion, and to lament that "the tears and blood spilt there, did not quench the sparks of our civil" discord here. But who began these dissensions? and what can be more openly known than those retardings and delays which by himself were continually devised, to hinder and put back the relief of those distressed protestants, whom he seems here to compassionate? The particulars are too well known to be recited, and too many.

But "he offered to go himself in person upon that expedition;" and reckons up many surmises why he thinks they would not suffer him. But mentions not that by his under-dealing to debauch armies here at home, and by his secret intercourse with the chief rebels, long ere that time every where known, he had brought the parliament into so just a diffidence of him, as that they durst not leave the public arms to his disposal, much less an army to his conduct.

He concludes, "That next the sin of those who began that rebellion, theirs must needs be who hindered the suppressing, or diverted the aids. But judgment rashly given, oftentimes involves the judge himself. He finds fault with those "who threatened all extremity to the rebels," and pleads much that mercy should be shown them. It seems he found himself not so much concerned as those who had lost fathers, brothers, wives and children by their cruelty; whom in justice to retaliate, is not as he supposes unevangelical; so long as magistracy and war are not laid down under the gospel. If this his sermon of affected mercy were not too pharisaical, how could he permit himself to cause the
laughter

slaughter of so many thousands here in England for mere prerogatives, the toys and gewgaws of his crown, for copes and surplices, the trinkets of his priests, and not perceive his own zeal, while he taxes others, to be most preposterous and unevangelical? Neither is there the same cause to destroy a whole city for the ravishing of a sister, not done out of villainy, and recompence offered by marriage; nor the same case for those disciples to summon fire from heaven upon the whole city where they were denied lodging; and for a nation by just war and execution to slay whole families of them who so barbarously had slain whole families before. Did not all Israel do as much against the Benjamites for one rape committed by a few, and defended by the whole tribe? and did they not the same to Jabesh-Gilead for not assisting them in that revenge? I speak not this, that such measure should be meted rigorously to all the Irish, or as remembering that the parliament ever so decreed; but to shew that this his homily hath more of craft and affectation in it, than of sound doctrine.

But it was happy that his going into Ireland was not consented to; for either he had certainly turned his intended forces against the parliament itself, or not gone at all; or had he gone, what work he would have made there, his own following words declare.

“He would have punished some;” no question; for some perhaps who were of least use, must of necessity have been sacrificed to his reputation, and the convenience of his affairs. Others he “would have disarmed;” that is to say, in his own time: but “all of them he would have protected from the fury of those that would have drowned them, if they had refused to swim down the popular stream.” These expressions are too often met, and too well understood for any man to doubt his meaning. By the “fury of those,” he means no other than the justice of parliament, to whom yet he had committed the whole business. Those who would have refused to swim down the popular stream, our constant key tells us to be papists, prelates, and their faction; these, by his own confession here, he would have protected against his puritan parliament: And by this who sees not that he and the Irish rebels had but one aim, one and the same drift, and would have forthwith joined in one body against us?

He goes on still in his tenderness of the Irish rebels, fearing lest “our zeal should be more greedy to kill the bear for his skin, than for any harm he hath done.” This either justifies the rebels to have done no harm at all, or infers his opinion that the parliament is more bloody and rapacious in the prosecution of their justice, than those rebels were in the execution of their barbarous cruelty. Let men doubt now and dispute to whom the king was a friend most, to his English parliament, or to his Irish rebels.

With whom, that we may yet see further how much he was their friend, after that the parliament had brought them every where either to famine, or a low condition, he, to give them all the respite and advantages they could desire, without advice of parliament, to whom he himself had committed the managing of that war, makes a cessation; in pretence to relieve the protestants, “overborn there with numbers,” but as the event proved, to support the papists, by diverting and drawing over the English army there, to his own service here against the parliament. For that the protestants were then on the winning hand, it must needs be plain; who notwithstanding the loss of those forces, which at their landing here mastered without difficulty great part of Wales and Cheshire, yet made a shift to keep their own in Ireland. But the plot of this Irish truce is in good part discovered in that declaration of September 30, 1643. And if the protestants were but handfuls there, as he calls them, why did he stop and way-lay both by land and sea, to his utmost power, those provisions and supplies which were sent by the parliament? How were so many handfuls called over, as for a while stood him in no small stead, and against our main forces here in England?

Since

Since therefore all the reasons that can be given of this cessation appear so false and frivolous, it may be justly feared that the design itself was most wicked and pernicious. What remains then? He "appeals to God," and is cast; likening his punishments to Job's trials, before he saw them to have Job's ending. He cannot stand "to make prolix apologies." Then surely those long pamphlets set out for declarations and remonstrances in his name, were none of his; and how they should be his indeed, being so repugnant to the whole course of his actions, augments the difficulty.

But he usurps a common saying, "That it is kingly to do well, and hear ill." That may be sometimes true: but far more frequently to do ill and hear well; so great is the multitude of flatterers, and them that deify the name of king.

Yet not content with these neighbours, we have him still a perpetual preacher of his own virtues, and of that especially, which who knows not to be Patience perforce?

He "believes it will at last appear that they who first began to embroil his other kingdoms, are also guilty of the blood of Ireland." And we believe so too; for now the cessation is become a peace by published articles, and commission to bring them over against England, first only ten thousand by the earl of Glamorgan, next all of them, if possible, under Ormond, which was the last of all his transactions done as a public person. And no wonder; for he looked upon the blood spilt, whether of subjects or of rebels, with an indifferent eye, "as exhausted out of his own veins; without distinguishing, as he ought, which was good blood and which corrupt; the not letting out whereof, endangers the whole body.

And what the doctrine is, ye may perceive also by the prayer, which after a short ejaculation for the "poor Protestants," prays at large for the Irish rebels, that God would not give them over, or "their children, to the covetousness, cruelty, fierce and cursed anger" of the parliament.

He finishes with a deliberate and solemn curse "upon himself and his father's house." Which how far God hath already brought to pass, is to the end that men by so eminent an example should learn to tremble at his judgments, and not play with imprecations.

XIII. Upon the calling in of the Scots, and their coming.

IT must needs seem strange to men who accustom themselves to ponder and contemplate things in their first original and institution, that kings, who, as all other officers of the public, were at first chosen and installed only by consent and suffrage of the people, to govern them as freemen by laws of their own framing, and to be, in consideration of that dignity and riches bestowed upon them, the intrusted servants of the commonwealth, should notwithstanding grow up to that dishonest encroachment, as to esteem themselves masters both of that great trust which they serve, and of the people that betruſted them: counting what they ought to do, both in discharge of their public duty, and for the great reward of honour and revenue which they receive, as done all of meer grace and favour; as if their power over us were by nature, and from themselves, or that God had sold us into their hands. This ignorance or wilful mistake of the whole matter, had taken so deep root in the imagination of this king, that whether to the English or to the Scot, mentioning what acts of his regal office, though God knows how unwillingly, he had passed, he calls them, as in other places, acts of grace and bounty; so here "special obligations, favours, to gratify active spirits, and the desires of that party." Words not only sounding pride and lordly usurpation, but injustice, partiality and corruption. For to the Irish he so far condescended, as first to tolerate in private, then to covenant openly the tolerating of popery: so far to the Scot, as to remove bishops, establish presbytery, and the Militia in their own hands; "preferring, as some thought, the desires of Scotland before his own interest and honour." But being

once on this side Tweed, his reason, his conscience, and his honour became so streightened with a kind of false virginity, that to the English neither one nor other of the same demands could be granted, wherewith the Scots were gratified; as if our air and climate on a sudden had changed the property and the nature both of conscience, honour, and reason, or that he found none so fit as English to be the subjects of his arbitrary power. Ireland was as Ephraim, the strength of his head, Scotland as Judah, was his lawgiver; but over England, as over Edom, he meant to cast his shoe: and yet so many sober Englishmen not sufficiently awake to consider this, like men enchanted with the Circæan cup of servitude, will not be held back from running their own heads into the yoke of bondage.

The sum of his discourse is against "settling of religion by violent means;" which whether it were the Scots design upon England, they are best able to clear themselves. But this of all may seem strangest, that the king, who, while it was permitted him, never did thing more eagerly than to molest and persecute the consciences of most religious men; he who had made a war, and lost all rather than not uphold a hierarchy of persecuting bishops, should have the confidence here to profess himself so much an enemy of those that force the conscience. For was it not he, who upon the English obtruded new ceremonies, upon the Scots a new Liturgy, and with his sword went about to engrave a bloody Rubric on their backs? Did he not forbid and hinder all effectual search of truth; nay, like a besieging enemy, stopt all her passages both by word and writing? Yet here can talk of "fair and equal disputations:" where notwithstanding, if all submit not to his judgment, as not being "rationally convicted," they must submit (and he conceals it not) to his penalty, as counted obstinate. But what if he himself and those his learned churchmen were the convicted or the obstinate part long ago; should reformation suffer them to sit lording over the Church in their fat bishoprics and pluralities, like the great whore that sitteth upon many waters, till they would vouchsafe to be disputed out? Or should we sit disputing, while they sat plotting and persecuting? Those clergymen were not "to be driven into the fold like sheep," as his simile runs, but to be driven out of the fold like wolves or thieves, where they sat fleecing those flocks which they never fed.

He believes "that presbytery, though proved to be the only institution of Jesus Christ, were not by the sword to be set up without his consent;" which is contrary both to the doctrine, and the known practice of all protestant churches, if his sword threaten those who of their own accord embrace it.

And although Christ and his apostles, being to civil affairs but private men, contended not with magistrates, yet when magistrates themselves, and especially parliaments, who have greatest right to dispose of the civil sword, come to know religion, they ought in conscience to defend all those who receive it willingly against the violence of any king or tyrant whatsoever. Neither is it therefore true, "that christianity is planted or watered with christian blood;" for there is a large difference between forcing men by the sword to turn Presbyterians, and defending those who willingly are so from a furious inroad of bloody bishops, armed with the Militia of a king their pupil. And if "covetousness and ambition be an argument that presbytery hath not much of Christ," it argues more strongly against episcopacy; which from the time of her first mounting to an order above the presbyters, had no other parents than covetousness and ambition. And those Sects, Schisms, and Heresies, which he speaks of, "if they get but strength and numbers," need no other pattern than episcopacy and himself, to "set up their ways by the like method of violence" Nor is there any thing that hath more marks of schism and sectarism than English episcopacy; whether we look at apostolic times, or at reformed Churches; for the "universal way of church-government before," may as soon lead us into gross error, as their universally corrupted doctrine. And Government, by reason of ambition, was likeliest to be corrupted much the sooner of the two. However, nothing can be to

us catholic or universal in religion, but what the Scripture teaches; whatsoever without Scripture pleads to be universal in the Church, in being universal is but the more schismatical. Much less can particular laws and constitutions impart to the Church of England any power of consistory or tribunal above other Churches, to be the sole judge of what is sect or schism, as with much rigour, and without Scripture they took upon them. Yet these the king resolves here to defend and maintain to his last, pretending, after all those conferences offered, or had with him, "not to see more rational and religious motives than soldiers carry in their knapsacks;" with one thus resolved, it was but folly to stand disputing.

He imagines, his own judicious zeal to be most concerned in his tuition of the Church. So thought Saul when he presumed to offer sacrifice, for which he lost his kingdom; so thought Uzziah when he went into the temple, but was thrust out with a leprosy for his opinioned zeal, which he thought judicious. It is not the part of a king, because he ought to defend the Church, therefore to set himself supreme head over the Church, or to meddle with ecclesial government, or to defend the Church otherwise than the Church would be defended; for such defence is bondage: nor to defend abuses, and stop all reformation under the name of "new moulds fancied and fashioned to private designs." The holy things of Church are in the power of other keys than were delivered to his keeping. Christian liberty, purchased with the death of our redeemer, and established by the sending of his free spirit to inhabit in us, is not now to depend upon the doubtful consent of any earthly monarch; nor to be again fettered with a presumptuous negative voice, tyrannical to the parliament, but much more tyrannical to the Church of God; which was compelled to implore the aid of parliament, to remove his force and heavy hands from off our consciences, who therefore complains now of that most just defensive force, because only it removed his violence and persecution. If this be a violation to his conscience, that it was hindered by the parliament from violating the more tender consciences of so many thousand good christians, let the usurping conscience of all tyrants be ever so violated.

He wonders, for wonder, how we could so much "distrust God's assistance," as to call in the protestant aid of our brethren in Scotland: why then did he, if his trust were in God and the justice of his cause, not scruple to solicit and invite earnestly the assistance both of papists and of Irish rebels? If the Scots were by us at length sent home, they were not called in to stay here always; neither was it for the people's ease to feed so many legions longer than their help was needful.

"The government of their kirk we despised not," but their imposing of that government upon us; not presbytery but arch-presbytery, Classical, Provincial, and Diocesan presbytery, claiming to itself a lordly power and superintendency both over flocks and pastors, over persons and congregations no way their own. But these debates in his judgment would have been ended better "by the best divines in christendom in a full and free synod." A most improbable way, and such as never yet was used, at least with good success, by any protestant kingdom or state since the reformation: Every true Church having wherewithal from heaven, and the assisting spirit of Christ implored, to be complete and perfect within itself. And the whole nation is not easily to be thought so raw, and so perpetually a novice after all this light, as to need the help and direction of other nations, more than what they write in public of their opinion, in a matter so familiar as Church-government.

In fine, he accuses Piety with the want of Loyalty, and Religion with the breach of Allegiance, as if God and he were one master, whose commands were so often contrary to the commands of God. He would persuade the Scots that their "chief interest consists in their fidelity to the crown." But true policy will teach them to find a safer interest in the common friendship of England, than in the ruins of one ejected family.

XIV. Upon the Covenant.

UPON this theme his discourse is long, his matter little but repetition, and therefore soon answered. First, after an abusive and strange apprehension of covenants, as if men "pawned their souls" to them with whom they covenant, he digresses to plead for bishops; first from the antiquity of their "possession here, since the first plantation of christianity in this island; next from "a universal prescription since the Apostles, till this last century." But what avails the most primitive antiquity against the plain sense of Scripture? which if the last century have best followed, it ought in our esteem to be the first. And yet it hath been often proved by learned men from the writings and epistles of most ancient christians, that episcopacy crept not up into an order above the presbyters, till many years after that the Apostles were deceased.

He next "is unsatisfied with the covenant," not only for "some passages in it referring to himself," as he supposes, "with very dubious and dangerous limitations," but for binding men "by oath and covenant" to the reformation of Church-discipline. First, those limitations were not more dangerous to him, than he to our liberty and religion; next, that which was there vowed, to cast out of the Church an antichristian hierarchy which God had not planted, but ambition and corruption had brought in, and fostered to the Church's great damage and oppression, was no point of controversy to be argued without end, but a thing of clear moral necessity to be forthwith done. Neither was the "Covenant superfluous, though former engagements both religious and legal bound us before:" But was the practice of all Churches heretofore intending reformation. All Israel, though bound enough before by the law of Moses "to all necessary duties;" yet with Aza their king entered into a new covenant at the beginning of a reformation: And the Jews after captivity, without consent demanded of that king who was their master, took solemn oath to walk in the commandments of God. All protestant Churches have done the like, notwithstanding former engagements to their several duties. And although his aim were to sow variance between "the protestation and the covenant," to reconcile them is not difficult. The protestation was but one step, extending only to the doctrine of the Church of England, as it was distinct from Church-discipline; the covenant went further, as it pleased God to dispense his light by degrees, and comprehended church-government: Former with latter steps in the progress of well-doing need not reconciliation. Nevertheless he breaks through to his conclusion, "that all honest and wise men ever thought themselves sufficiently bound by former ties of religion;" leaving Aza, Ezra, and the whole Church of God in sundry ages to shift for honesty and wisdom from some other than his testimony. And although after-contracts absolve not till the former be made void, yet he first having done that, our duty returns back, which to him was neither moral nor eternal, but conditional.

Willing to persuade himself that many "good men" took the covenant, either unwarily or out of fear, he seems to have bestowed some thoughts how these "good men" following his advice may keep the covenant and not keep it. The first evasion is, presuming "that the chief end of covenanting in such men's intentions was to preserve religion in purity, and the kingdom's peace." But the covenant will more truly inform them that purity of religion and the kingdom's peace was not then in state to be preserved, but to be restored; and therefore binds them not to a preservation of what was, but to a reformation of what was evil, what was traditional and dangerous, whether novelty or antiquity, in church or state. To do this, clashes with "no former oath" lawfully sworn either to God or the king, and rightly understood.

In general, he brands all "such confederations by league and covenant, as the common road used in all factious perturbations of state and church." This kind of language

guage reflects with the same ignominy upon all the protestant reformations that have been since Luther; and so indeed doth his whole book, replenished throughout with hardly other words or arguments, than papists, and especially popish kings, have used heretofore against their protestant subjects: whom he would persuade to be "every man his own pope, and to absolve himself of those ties," by the suggestion of false or equivocal interpretations too oft repeated to be now answered.

The parliament, he saith, "made their covenant like Manna, agreeable to every man's palate." This is another of his glosses upon the covenant; he is content to let it be Manna, but his drift is that men should loath it, or at least expound it by their own "relish," and "latitude of sense;" wherein lest any one of the simpler sort should fail to be his crafts-master, he furnishes him with two or three laxative, he terms them "general clauses, which may serve somewhat to relieve them" against the covenant taken: intimating, as if "what were lawful and according to the word of God," were no otherwise so, than as every man fancied to himself. From such learned explications and resolutions as these upon the covenant, what marvel if no royalist or malignant refuse to take it, as having learnt from these princely instructions his many "Salvoes, cautions, and reservations," how to be a covenanter and anticovenanter, how at once to be a Scot, and an Irish rebel.

He returns again to disallow of "that Reformation which the Covenant" vows, "as being the partial advice of a few Divines." But matters of this moment, as they were not to be decided there by those divines, so neither are they to be determined here by essays and curtal aphorisms, but by solid proofs of scripture.

The rest of his discourse he spends, highly accusing the parliament, "that the main reformation by" them "intended, was to rob the Church," and much applauding himself both for "his forwardness" to all due reformation, and his averseness from all such kind of Sacrilege. All which, with his glorious title of the "Church's Defender," we leave him to make good by Pharaoh's divinity," if he please, for to Joseph's Piety it will be a task unsuitable. As for "the parity and poverty of ministers," which he takes to be of so sad "consequence," the scripture reckons them for two special legacies left by our Saviour to his disciples; under which two primitive nurses, for such they were indeed, the church of God more truly flourished than ever after, since the time that imparity and church-revenue rushing in, corrupted and belepered all the clergy with a worse infection than Gehazi's; some one of whose tribe, rather than a king, I should take to be compiler of that unsalted and Simonical prayer annexed: although the prayer itself strongly prays against them. For never such holy things as he means, were given to more swine, nor the church's bread more to Dogs, than when it fed ambitious, irreligious and dumb prelates.

XV. Upon the many jealousies, &c.

TO wipe off jealousies and scandals, the best way had been by clear actions, or till actions could be cleared, by evident reasons; but meer words we are too well acquainted with. Had "his honour and reputation been dearer to him" than the lust of reigning, how could the parliament of either nation have laid so often at his door the breach of words, promises, acts, oaths, and execrations, as they do avowedly in many of their petitions and addresses to him? Thither I remit the reader. And who can believe that whole parliaments, elected by the people from all parts of the land, should meet in one mind and resolution not to advise him, but to conspire against him, in a worse powder-plot than Catesbie's, "to blow up," as he terms it, "the people's affection towards him, and batter down their loyalty by the engines of foul aspersions:" Water-works rather than engines to batter with, yet those aspersions were raised from the foulness of his own actions. Whereof to purge himself, he uses no other argument than a general and so often iterated

iterated commendation of himself; and thinks that court holy-water hath the virtue of expiation, at least with the silly people, to whom he familiarly imputes sin where none is, to seem liberal of his forgiveness where none is asked or needed.

What ways he hath taken toward the prosperity of his people, which he would seem "so earnestly to desire," if we do but once call to mind, it will be enough to teach us, looking on the smooth insinuations here, that tyrants are not more flattered by their slaves, than forced to flatter others whom they fear.

For the people's "tranquillity he would willingly be the Jonah;" but lest he should be taken at his word, pretends to foresee within ken two imaginary "winds" never heard of in the compass, which threaten, if he be cast over board, "to increase the storm;" but that controversy divine lot hath ended.

"He had rather not rule, than that his people should be ruined;" and yet above these twenty years hath been ruining the people about the niceties of his ruling. He is accurate "to put a difference between the plague of malice, and the ague of mistakes, the itch of novelty, and the leprosy of disloyalty." But had he as well known how to distinguish between the venerable grey hairs of ancient religion, and the old scurff of superstition, between the wholesome heat of well governing, and the feverous rage of tyrannizing, his judgment in state-physic had been of more authority.

Much he prophesies, "that the credit of those men who have cast black scandals on him, shall ere long be quite blasted by the same furnace of popular obloquy, wherein they sought to cast his name and honour." I believe not that a Romish gilded portraiture gives better oracle than a Babylonish golden image could do, to tell us truly who heated that furnace of obloquy, or who deserves to be thrown in, Nebuchadnezzar or the three kingdoms. It "gave him great cause to suspect his own innocence," that he was opposed by "so many who profess singular piety." But this qualm was soon over, and he concluded rather to suspect their religion than his own innocence, affirming that "many with him were both learned and religious above the ordinary size." But if his great seal without the parliament were not sufficient to create lords, his parole must needs be far more unable to create learned and religious men; and who shall authorize his unlearned judgment to point them out?

He guesses that "many well-minded men were by popular preachers urged to oppose him." But the opposition undoubtedly proceeded and continues from heads far wiser, and spirits of a nobler strain; those priest-led Herodians with their blind guides are in the ditch already; travelling, as they thought, to Sion, but moored in the Isle of Wight.

He thanks God "for his constancy to the protestant religion both abroad and at home." Abroad, his letter to the pope; at home, his innovations in the church will speak his constancy in religion what it was, without further credit to this vain boast.

His "using the assistance of some papists," as the cause might be, could not hurt his religion; but in the settling of protestantism their aid was both unseemly and suspicious, and inferred that the greatest part of protestants were against him and his obtruded settlement.

But this is strange indeed, that he should appear now teaching the parliament what no man, till this was read, thought ever he had learned, "that difference of persuasion in religious matters may fall out where there is the sameness of allegiance and subjection." If he thought so from the beginning, wherefore was there such compulsion used to the puritans of England, and the whole realm of Scotland, about conforming to a liturgy? Wherefore no bishop no king? Wherefore episcopacy more agreeable to monarchy, if different persuasions in religion may agree in one duty and allegiance? Thus do court-maxims like court-minions, rise or fall as the king pleases.

Not to tax him for want of elegance as a courtier, in writing Oglia for Olla the Spanish word, it might be well affirmed that there was a greater Medley and disproportioning of religions,

religions, to mix papists with protestants in a religious cause, than to entertain all those diversified sects, who yet were all protestants, one religion, though many opinions.

Neither was it "any shame to protestants," that he a declared papist, if his own letter to the pope, not yet renounced, belye him not, found so few protestants of his religion, as enforced him to call in both the counsel and the aid of papists to help establish protestancy, who were led on, not "by the sense of their allegiance," but by the hope of his apostacy to Rome, from disputing to warring; his own voluntary and first appeal.

His hearkning to evil counsellors, charged upon him so often by the parliament, he puts off as "a device of those men who were so eager to give him better counsel." That "those men" were the parliament, and that he ought to have used the counsel of none but those, as a king, is already known. What their civility laid upon evil counsellors, he himself most commonly owned; but the event of those evil counsels "the Enormities, the confusions, the miseries," he transfers from the guilt of his own civil broils to the just resistance made by parliament; and imputes what miscarriages of his they could not yet remove for his opposing, as if they were some new misdemeanors of their bringing in, and not the inveterate diseases of his own bad government; which, with a disease as bad, he falls again to magnify and commend: and may all those who would be governed by his "Retractions and concessions," rather than by laws of parliament, admire his self-encumbrances, and be flattered with that "Crown of patience" to which he cunningly exhorted them, that his monarchical foot might have the setting it upon their heads.

That trust which the parliament faithfully discharged in the asserting of our liberties, he calls, "another artifice to withdraw the people from him to their designs." What piece of justice could they have demanded for the people, which the jealousy of a king might not have miscalled a design to disparage his government, and to ingratiate themselves? To be more just, religious, wise, or magnanimous than the common sort, stirs up in a tyrant both fear and envy; and straight he cries out popularity, which in his account is little less than treason. The sum is, they thought to regulate and limit his negative voice, and share with him in the Militia, both or either of which he could not possibly hold without consent of the people, and not be absolutely a tyrant. He professes "to desire no other liberty than what he envies not his subjects according to law;" yet fought with might and main against his subjects, to have a sole power over them in his hand, both against and beyond law. As for the philosophical liberty which in vain he talks of, we may conclude him very ill trained up in those free notions, who to civil liberty was so injurious.

He calls the conscience "God's sovereignty;" why then doth he contest with God about that supreme title? Why did he lay restraints, and force enlargements upon our consciences in things for which we were to answer God only and the church? God bids us "be subject for conscience sake," that is as to a magistrate, and in the laws; not usurping over spiritual things, as Lucifer beyond his sphere.

Finally, having laid the fault of these commotions, not upon his own misgovernment, but upon the "ambition of others, the necessity of some mens fortune, and thirst after novelty," he bodes himself "much honour and reputation, that like the sun shall rise and recover himself to such a splendor, as owls, bats, and such fatal birds shall be unable to bear." Poets indeed use to vapour much after this manner. But to bad kings, who without cause expect future glory from their actions, it happens as to bad poets, who sit and starve themselves with a delusive hope to win immortality by their bad lines. For though men ought not to "speak evil of dignities" which are just, yet nothing hinders us to speak evil, as oft as it is the truth, of those who in their dignities do evil. Thus did our Saviour himself, John the Baptist, and Stephen the Martyr. And those "black veils" of his own misdeeds he might be sure would ever keep "his face from shining," till he could "refute evil speaking with well doing," which grace he seems here to pray for; and his prayer doubtless as it was prayed, so it was heard. But even his prayer is so ambitious

tious of prerogative, that it dares ask away the prerogative of Christ himself, "To become the head-stone of the corner."

XVI. Upon the Ordinance against the Common-Prayer Book.

WHAT to think of liturgies, both the sense of scripture, and apostolical practice would have taught him better, than his human reasonings and conjectures: nevertheless, what weight they have, let us consider. If it "be no news to have all innovations ushered in with the name of reformation," sure it is less news to have all reformation censured and opposed under the name of innovation, by those, who being exalted in high place above their merit, fear all change, though of things never so ill or so unwisely settled. So hardly can the dotage of those that dwell upon antiquity allow present times any share of godliness or wisdom.

The removing of liturgy he traduces to be done only as a "thing plausible to the people;" whose rejection of it he likens, with small reverence, to the crucifying of our Saviour; next, that it was done "to please those men who gloried in their extemporary vein," meaning the ministers. For whom it will be best to answer, as was answered for the man born blind, "They are of age, let them speak for themselves;" not how they came blind, but whether it were liturgy that held them tongue-tied.

"For the matter contained in that book," we need no better witness than king Edward the Sixth, who to the Cornish rebels confesses it was no other than the old mass-book done into English, all but some few words that were expunged. And by this argument which king Edward so promptly had to use against that irreligious rabble, we may be assured it was the carnal fear of those divines and politicians that modelled the liturgy no farther off from the old mass, lest by too great an alteration they should incense the people, and be destitute of the same shifts to fly to, which they had taught the young king.

"For the manner of using set forms, there is no doubt but that wholesome" matter, and good desires rightly conceived in the heart, wholesome words will follow of themselves. Neither can any true christian find a reason why liturgy should be at all admitted, a prescription not imposed or practised by those first founders of the church, who alone had that authority: without whose precept or example, how constantly the priest puts on his gown and surplice, so constantly doth his prayer put on a servile yoke of liturgy. This is evident, that they "who use no set forms of prayer," have words from their affections; while others are to seek affections fit and proportionable to a certain dose of prepared words; which as they are not rigorously forbid to any man's private infirmity, so to imprison and confine by force, into a pinfold of set words, those two most unimprisonable things, our prayers, and that divine spirit of utterance that moves them, is a tyranny that would have longer hands than those giants who threatened bondage to heaven. What we may do in the same form of words is not so much the question, as whether liturgy may be forced, as he forced it. It is true that we "pray to the same God;" must we therefore always use the same words? Let us then use but one word, because we pray to one God. "We profess the same truths," but the liturgy comprehends not all truths: "we read the same scriptures," but never read that all those sacred expressions, all benefit and use of scripture, as to public prayer, should be denied us, except what was barrelled up in a common-prayer book with many mixtures of their own, and which is worse, without salt. But suppose them savoury words and unmixed, suppose them Manna it self, yet if they shall be boarded up and enjoined us, while God every morning rains down new expressions into our hearts; instead of being fit to use, they will be found like reserved Manna, rather to breed worms and stink. "We have the same duties upon us, and feel the same wants:" yet not always the same, nor at all times alike; but with variety of circumstances, which ask variety of words: whereof God hath given us plenty; not to use

use so copiously upon all other occasions, and so niggardly to him alone in our devotions. As if christians were now in a worse famine of words fit for prayer, than was of food at the siege of Jerusalem, when perhaps the priests being to remove the shew-bread, as was accustomed, were compelled every sabbath day for want of other loaves, to bring again still the same. If the "Lord's Prayer" had been the "warrant or the pattern of set liturgies," as is here affirmed, why was neither that prayer, nor any other set form ever after used, or so much as mentioned by the Apostles, much less commended to our use? Why was their care wanting in a thing so useful to the church? so full of danger and contention to be left undone by them to other men's penning, of whose authority we could not be so certain? Why was this forgotten by them, who declare that they have revealed to us the whole counsel of God; who as he left our affections to be guided by his sanctifying spirit, so did he likewise our words to be put into us without our premeditation; not only those cautious words to be used before gentiles and tyrants, but much more those filial words, of which we have so frequent use in our access with freedom of speech to the throne of grace. Which to lay aside for other outward dictates of men, were to injure him and his perfect gift, who is the spirit and the giver of our ability to pray; as if his ministration were incomplete, and that to whom he gave affections, he did not also afford utterance to make his gift of prayer a perfect gift.

And although the gift were only natural, yet voluntary prayers are less subject to formal and superficial tempers than set forms: for in those, at least for words and matter, he who prays must consult first with his heart, which in likelihood may stir up his affections; in these having both words and matter ready made to his lips, which is enough to make up the outward act of prayer, his affections grow lazy, and come not up easily at the call of words not their own; the prayer also having less intercourse and sympathy with a heart wherein it was not conceived, saves itself the labour of so long a journey downward, and flying up in haste on the specious wings of formality, if it fall not back again headlong, instead of a prayer which was expected, presents God with a set of stale and empty words.

No doubt but "ostentation and formality" may taint the best duties; we are not therefore to leave duties for no duties, and to turn prayer into a kind of lurry. Cannot unpremeditated babblings be rebuked, and restrained in whom we find they are, but the spirit of God must be forbidden in all men? But it is the custom of bad men and hypocrites to take advantage at the least abuse of good things, that under that covert they may remove the goodness of those things, rather than the abuse. And how unknowingly, how weakly is the using of set forms attributed here to "constancy," as if it were constancy in the cuckoo to be always in the same liturgy.

Much less can it be lawful that an Englished mass-book, composed, for aught we know, by men neither learned, nor godly, should juggle out, or at any time deprive us the exercise of that heavenly gift, which God by special promise pours out daily upon his church, that is to say, the spirit of prayer. Whereof to help those many infirmities, which he reckons up, "Rudeness, Impertinency, Flatness," and the like, we have a remedy of God's finding out, which is not liturgy, but his own free spirit. Though we know not what to pray as we ought, yet he with sighs unutterable by any words, much less by a stunted liturgy dwelling in us, makes intercession for us according to the mind and will of God both in private, and in the performance of all ecclesiastical duties. For it is his promise also, that where two or three gathered together in his name shall agree to ask him any thing, it shall be granted; for he is there in the midst of them. If any ancient churches to remedy the infirmities of prayer, or rather the infections of Arian and Pelagian heresies, neglecting that ordained and promised help of the spirit, betook them almost four hundred years after Christ to liturgy their own invention, we are not to imitate them; nor to distrust God in the removal of that truant-help to our devotion, which by him never was appointed. And what is said of liturgy, is said also of directory, if it be im-

posed : although to forbid the service-book there be much more reason, as being of itself superstitious, offensive, and indeed, though Englished, yet still the mass-book : and public places ought to be provided of such as need not the help of liturgies or directories continually, but are supported with ministerial gifts answerable to their calling.

Lastly, that the common-prayer book was rejected because it "prayed so oft for him," he had no reason to object : for what large and laborious prayers were made for him in the pulpits, if he never heard, it is doubtful they were never heard in heaven. We might now have expected that his own following prayer should add much credit to set forms ; but on the contrary we find the same imperfections in it, as in most before, which he lays here upon extemporal. Nor doth he ask of God to be directed whether liturgies be lawful, but presumes, and in a manner would persuade him that they be so ; praying "that the church and he may never want them." What could be prayed worse extempore ?

XVII. Of the differences in point of Church-Government.

THE government of church by bishops hath been so fully proved from the scriptures to be vicious and usurped, that whether out of piety or policy maintained, it is not much material : for piety grounded upon error, can no more justify king Charles, than it did queen Mary in the sight of God or man. This however must not be let pass without a serious observation ; God having so disposed the author in this chapter as to confess and discover more of mystery and combination between tyranny and false religion, than from any other hand would have been credible. Here we may see the very dark roots of them both turned up, and how they twine and interweave one another in the earth, tho' above ground shooting up in two severed branches. We may have learnt both from sacred story, and times of reformation, that the kings of this world have both ever hated, and instinctively feared the church of God. Whether it be for that their doctrine seems much to favour two things to them so dreadful, liberty and equality ; or because they are the children of that kingdom, which, as ancient prophecies have foretold, shall in the end break to pieces and dissolve all their great power and dominion. And those kings and potentates who have strove most to rid themselves of this fear, by cutting off or suppressing the true church, have drawn upon themselves the occasion of their own ruin, while they thought with most policy to prevent it. Thus Pharaoh, when once he began to fear and wax jealous of the Israelites, lest they should multiply and fight against him, and that his fear stirred him up to afflict and keep them under, as the only remedy of what he feared, soon found that the evil which before slept, came suddenly upon him, by the preposterous way he took to prevent it. Passing by examples between, and not shutting wilfully our eyes, we may see the like story brought to pass in our own land. This king, more than any before him, except perhaps his father, from his first entrance to the crown, harbouring in his mind a strange fear and suspicion of men most religious, and their doctrine, which in his own language he here acknowledges, terming "it the seditious exorbitancy" of ministers tongues, and doubting "lest they," as he not christianly expresses it, "should with the keys of heaven let out peace and loyalty from the people's hearts : " though they never preached or attempted aught that might justly raise in him such thoughts, he could not rest, or think himself secure, so long as they remained in any of his three kingdoms unrooted out. But outwardly professing the same religion with them, he could not presently use violence as Pharaoh did, and that course had with others before but ill succeeded. He chooses therefore a more mystical way, a newer method of antichristian fraud, to the church more dangerous : and like to Balack the son of Zippor, against a nation of prophets thinks it best to hire other esteemed prophets, and to undermine and wear out the true church by a false ecclesiastical policy. To this drift he found the government of bishops most serviceable ; an order in the church, as by men first corrupted, so mutualliy corrupting

corrupting them who receive it, both in judgment and manners. He, by conferring bishoprics and great livings on whom he thought most pliant to his will, against the known canons and universal practice of the ancient church, whereby those elections were the people's right, sought, as he confesses, to have "greatest influence upon Churchmen." They on the other side finding themselves in a high dignity, neither founded by scripture, nor allowed by reformation, nor supported by any spiritual gift or grace of their own, knew it their best course to have dependance only upon him: and wrought his fancy by degrees to that degenerate and unkingly persuasion of "No bishop, no King." Whenas on the contrary all prelates in their own subtle sense are of another mind; according to that of Pius the fourth, remembered in the history of Trent, that bishops then grow to be most vigorous and potent, when princes happen to be most weak and impotent. Thus when both interests of tyranny and episcopacy were incorporate into each other, the king, whose principal safety and establishment consisted in the righteous execution of his civil power, and not in bishops and their wicked counsels, fatally driven on, set himself to the removal of those men whose doctrine and desire of church-discipline he so feared would be the undoing of his monarchy. And because no temporal law could touch the innocence of their lives, he begins with the persecution of their consciences, laying scandals before them; and makes that the argument to inflict his unjust penalties both on their bodies and estates. In this war against the church, if he had sped so, as other haughty monarchs whom God heretofore hath hardened to the like enterprize, we ought to look up with praises and thanksgiving to the author of our deliverance, to whom victory and power, majesty, honour and dominion belongs for ever.

In the mean while, from his own words we may perceive easily that the special motives which he had to endear and deprave his judgment to the favouring and utmost defending of episcopacy, are such as here we represent them: and how unwillingly, and with what mental reservation he condescended against his interest to remove it out of the peers house, hath been shewn already. The reasons, which he affirms wrought so much upon his judgment, shall be so far answered as they be urged.

Scripture he pretends, but produces none, and next the "constant practice of all christian churches, till of late years tumult, faction, pride, and covetousness, invented new models under the title of Christ's government." Could any papist have spoke more scandalously against all reformation? Well may the parliament and best-affected people not now be troubled at his calumnies and reproaches, since he binds them in the same bundle with all other the reformed churches; who also may now further see, besides their own bitter experience, what a cordial and well-meaning helper they had of him abroad, and how true to the protestant cause.

As for Histories to prove bishops, the bible, if we mean not to run into errors, varieties, and uncertainties, must be our only history. Which informs us that the apostles were not properly bishops; next, that bishops were not successors of apostles, in the function of apostleship: and that if they were apostles, they could not be precisely bishops; if bishops, they could not be apostles, this being universal, extraordinary, and immediate from God; that being an ordinary, fixed, and particular charge and continual inspection over a certain flock. And although an ignorance and deviation of the ancient churches afterward, may with as much reason and charity be supposed as sudden in point of prelacy, as in other manifest corruptions, yet that "no example since the first age for 1500 years can be produced of any settled church, wherein were many ministers and congregations, which had not some bishops above them;" the ecclesiastical story, to which he appeals for want of scripture, proves clearly to be a false and over-confident assertion. Sozomenus, who wrote above twelve hundred years ago, in his seventh book, relates from his own knowledge, that in the churches of Cyprus and Arabia (places near to Jerusalem, and with the first frequented by apostles) they had bishops

in every village; and what could those be more than presbyters? The like he tells of other nations; and that episcopal churches in those days did not condemn them. I add, that many western churches, eminent for their faith and good works, and settled above four hundred years ago in France, in Piemont and Bohemia, have both taught and practised the same doctrine, and not admitted of episcopacy among them. And if we may believe what the papists themselves have written of these churches, which they call Waldenses, I find it in a book written almost four hundred years since, and set forth in the Bohemian history, that those churches in Piemont have held the same doctrine and government, since the time that Constantine with his mischievous donations poisoned Sylvester and the whole church. Others affirm they have so continued there since the apostles, and Theodorus Belvederensis in his relation of them, confesseth that those heresies, as he names them, were from the first times of christianity in that place. For the rest I refer me to that famous testimony of Jerom, who upon that very place which he cites here, the epistle to Titus, declares openly that bishop and presbyter were one and the same thing; till by the instigation of Satan, partialities grew up in the church, and that bishops rather by custom than any ordainment of Christ, were exalted above presbyters: whose interpretation we trust shall be received before this intricate stuff tattled here of Timothy and Titus, and I know not whom their successors, far beyond court-element, and as far beneath true edification. These are his "fair grounds both from scripture-canon and ecclesiastical examples;" how undivine-like written, and how like a worldly gospeller that understands nothing of these matters, posterity no doubt will be able to judge; and will but little regard what he calls Apostolical, who in his letter to the pope calls apostolical the Roman religion.

Nor let him think to plead, that therefore "it was not policy of state," or obstinacy in him which upheld episcopacy, because the injuries and losses which he sustained by so doing were to him "more considerable than episcopacy itself;" for all this might Pharaoh have had to say in his excuse of detaining the Israelites, that his own and his kingdom's safety, so much endangered by his denial, was to him more dear than all their building labours could be worth to Egypt. But whom God hardens, them also he blinds.

He endeavours to make good episcopacy not only in "religion, but from the nature of all civil government, where parity breeds confusion and faction." But of faction and confusion, to take no other than his own testimony, where hath more been ever bred than under the imparity of his own monarchical government? of which to make at this time longer dispute, and from civil constitutions and human conceits to debate and question the convenience of divine ordinations, is neither wisdom nor sobriety: and to confound Mosaic Priesthood with evangelic presbytery against express institution, is as far from warrantable. As little to purpose is it, that we should stand polling the reformed churches, whether they equalize in number "those of his three kingdoms;" of whom so lately the far greater part, what they have long desired to do, have now quite thrown off episcopacy.

Neither may we count it the language or religion of a protestant, so to vilify the best reformed churches (for none of them but Lutherans retain bishops) as to fear more the scandalizing of papists, because more numerous, than of our protestant brethren, because a handfull. It will not be worth the while to say what "Schismatics or Heretics" have had no bishops; yet lest he should be taken for a great reader, he who prompted him, if he were a doctor, might have remembered the forementioned place in Sozomenus; which affirms, that besides the Cyprians and Arabians who were counted orthodoxal, the Novatians also, and Montanists in Phrygia had no other bishops than such as were in every village: and what presbyter hath a narrower diocese? As for the Aërians we know of no heretical opinion justly fathered upon them, but that they held bishops and presbyters to be the same. Which he in this place not obscurely seems to hold a
heresy

heresy in all the reformed churches; with whom why the church of England desired conformity, he can find no reason with all his "charity, but the coming in of the Scots army;" such a high esteem he had of the English.

He tempts the clergy to return back again to bishops, from the fear of "tenuity and contempt," and the assurance of better "thriving under the favour of princes;" against which temptations if the clergy cannot arm themselves with their own spiritual armour, they are indeed as "poor a carcass" as he terms them.

Of secular honours and great revenues added to the dignity of prelates, since the subject of that question is now removed, we need not spend time: But this perhaps will never be unseasonable to bear in mind out of Chrysostom, that when ministers came to have lands, houses, farms, coaches, horses, and the like lumber, then religion brought forth riches in the church, and the daughter devoured the mother.

But if his judgment in episcopacy may be judged by the goodly choice he made of bishops, we need not much amuse ourselves with the consideration of those evils which, by his foretelling, will "necessarily follow" their pulling down, until he prove that the apostles, having no certain diocese or appointed place of residence, were properly "bishops over those presbyters whom they ordained, or churches they planted;" wherein oft-times their labours were both joint and promiscuous: Or that the apostolic power must "necessarily descend to bishops, the use and end" of either function being so different. And how the church hath flourished under episcopacy, let the multitude of their ancient and gross errors testify, and the words of some learnedest and most zealous bishops among them; Nazianzen in a devout passion wishing prelaty had never been; Basil terming them the slaves of slaves; Saint Martin, the enemies of Saints, and confessing that after he was made a bishop, he found much of that grace decay in him which he had before.

Concerning his "Coronation-Oath," what it was, and how far it bound him, already hath been spoken. This we may take for certain, that he was never sworn to his own particular conscience and reason, but to our conditions as a free people; which required him to give us such laws as ourselves should chuse. This the Scots could bring him to, and would not be baffled with the pretence of a coronation-oath, after that episcopacy had for many years been settled there. Which concession of his to them, and not to us, he seeks here to put off with evasions that are ridiculous. And to omit no shifts, he alledges that the presbyterian manners gave him no encouragement to like their Modes of government. If that were so, yet certainly those men are in most likelihood nearer to amendment, who seek a stricter church-discipline than that of episcopacy, under which the most of them learned their manners. If estimation were to be made of God's law by their manners, who leaving Egypt, received it in the wilderness, it could reap from such an inference as this, nothing but rejection and disesteem.

For the prayer wherewith he closes, it had been good some safe liturgy, which he so commends, had rather been in his way; it would perhaps in some measure have performed the end for which they say liturgy was first invented, and have hindered him both here, and at other times, from turning his notorious errors into his prayers.

XVIII. Upon the Uxbridge Treaty, &c.

IF the way of treaties be looked upon" in general, "as a retiring" from bestial force to human reason, his first aphorism here is in part deceived. For men may treat like beasts as well as fight. If some fighting were not manlike, then either fortitude were no virtue, or no fortitude in fighting: And as politicians oft-times through dilatory purposes and emulations handle the matter, there hath been no where found more bestiality than

than in treating; which hath no more commendation in it, than from fighting to come to undermining, from violence to craft, and when they can no longer do as lions, to do as foxes.

The sincerest end of treating after war once proclaimed, is either to part with more, or to demand less than was at first fought for, rather than to hazard more lives, or worse mischiefs. What the parliament in that point were willing to have done, when first after the war begun, they petitioned him at Colebrook to vouchsafe a treaty, is unknown. For after he had taken God to witness of his continual readiness to treat, or to offer treaties to the avoiding of bloodshed, taking the advantage of a mist, the fittest weather for deceit and treachery, he follows at the heels those messengers of peace with a train of covert war; and with a bloody surprize falls on our secure forces which lay quartering at Brentford in the thoughts and expectation of a treaty. And although in them who make a trade of war, and against a natural enemy, such an onset might in the rigour of martial law have been excused, while arms were not yet by agreement suspended; yet by a king, who seemed so heartily to accept of treating, and professes here, "he never wanted either desire or disposition to it, professes to have greater confidence in his reason than in his sword, and as a christian to seek peace and ensue it," such bloody and deceitful advantages would have been forborn one day at least, if not much longer; in whom there had not been a thirst rather than a detestation of civil war and blood.

In the midst of a second treaty not long after, fought by the parliament, and after much ado obtained with him at Oxford, what subtle and unpeaceable designs he then had in chace, his own letters discovered: What attempts of treacherous hostility successful and unsuccessful he made against Bristol, Scarborough, and other places, the proceedings of that treaty will soon put us in mind; and how he was so far from granting more of reason after so much of blood, that he denied then to grant what before he had offered; making no other use of treaties pretending peace, than to gain advantages that might enable him to continue war: What marvel then if "he thought it no diminution of himself," as oft as he saw his time, "to be importunate for treaties," when he fought them only, as by the upshot appeared, "to get opportunities?"

But he infers, as if the parliament would have compelled him to part with something of "his honour as a king." What honour could he have, or call his, joined not only with the offence or disturbance, but with the bondage and destruction of three nations? whereof, though he be careless and improvident, yet the parliament, by our laws and freedom, ought to judge, and use prevention; our laws else were but cobweb laws. And what were all his most rightful honours, but the people's gift, and the investment of that lustre, majesty and honour, which for the public good, and no otherwise, redounds from a whole nation into one person? So far is any honour from being his to a common mischief and calamity. Yet still he talks on equal terms with the grand representative of that people, for whose sake he was a king, as if the general welfare and his subservient rights were of equal moment or consideration. His aim indeed hath ever been to magnify and exalt his borrowed rights and prerogatives above the parliament and kingdom of whom he holds them. But when a king sets himself to bandy against the highest court and residence of his regal authority, he then, in the single person of a man, fights against his own majesty and kingship, and then indeed sets the first hand to his own deposing.

"The treaty at Uxbridge" he saith, "gave the fairest hopes of a happy composure;" fairest indeed, if his instructions to bribe our commissioners with the promise of Security, Rewards, and Places were fair: What other hopes it gave, no man can tell. There being but three main heads whereon to be treated; Ireland, episcopacy, and the militia; the first was anticipated and forestalled by a peace at any rate to be hastened with the Irish rebels, ere the treaty could begin, that he might pretend his word and honour past against "the specious and popular arguments" (he calls them no better) which the parliament would urge upon him for the continuance of that just war. Episcopacy he
bids

bids the queen be confident he will never quit; which informs us by what patronage it stood: And the sword he resolves to clutch as fast, as if God with his own hand had put it into his. This was the "moderation which he brought;" this was as far as reason, honour, conscience, and the queen, who was his regent in all these, would give him leave. Lastly, for composure, instead of happy, how miserable it was more likely to have been, wise men could then judge; when the English, during treaty, were called rebels, the Irish, good and catholic subjects; and the parliament before-hand, though for fashion's sake, called a parliament, yet by a jesuitical slight not acknowledged, though called so; but privately in the council-books inrolled no parliament: that if accommodation had succeeded, upon what terms soever, such a devilish fraud was prepared, that the king in his own esteem had been absolved from all performance, as having treated with rebels, and no parliament; and they on the other side, instead of an expected happiness, had been brought under the hatchet. Then no doubt "war had ended," that massacre and tyranny might begin. These Jealousies, however raised, let all men see whether they be diminished or allayed, by the letters of his own cabinet opened. And yet the breach of this treaty is laid all upon the parliament and their commissioners, with odious names of Pertinacy, hatred of Peace, Faction, and Covetousness, nay his own brat Superstition is laid to their charge; notwithstanding his here professed resolution to continue both the Order, Maintenance, and Authority, of prelates, as a truth of God.

And who "were most to blame in the unsuccessfulness of that treaty," his appeal is to God's decision; believing to be very excusable at that tribunal. But if ever man gloried in an inflexible stiffness, he came not behind any: and that grand maxim, always to put something into his treaties, which might give colour to refuse all that was in other things granted, and to make them signify nothing, was his own principal maxim and particular instructions to his commissioners. Yet all, by his own verdict, must be construed Reason in the king, and depraved Temper in the parliament.

That the "highest tide of success," with these principles and designs, "set him not above a treaty," no great wonder. But that his lowest ebb could not be lower than a fight, was a presumption that ruined him.

He presaged the future "unsuccessfulness of treaties by the unwillingness of some men to treat;" and could not see what was present, that their unwillingness had good cause to proceed from the continual experience of his own obstinacy and breach of word.

His prayer therefore of forgiveness to the guilty of "that treaty's breaking," he had good reason to say heartily over, as including no man in that guilt sooner than himself.

As for that protestation following in his prayer, "how oft have I entreated for peace, but when I speak thereof they make them ready to war;" unless he thought himself still in that perfidious mist between Colebrook and Hounslow, and thought that mist could hide him from the eye of heaven as well as of man, after such a bloody recompence given to our first offers of peace, how could this in the sight of heaven without horrors of conscience be uttered?

XIX. Upon the various events of the War.

IT is no new or unwonted thing for bad men to claim as much part in God as his best servants; to usurp and imitate their words, and appropriate to themselves those properties which belong only to the good and righteous. This not only in Scripture is familiarly to be found, but here also in this chapter of Apocrypha. He tells us much, why "it pleased God" to send him victory or loss (although what in so doing was the intent of God, he might be much mistaken as to his own particular) but we are yet to learn what real good use he made thereof in his practice.

Those numbers which he grew to "from small beginnings," were not such as out of love came to protect him, for none approved his actions as a king, except courtiers and prelates, but were such as fled to be protected by him from the fear of that reformation which the pravity of their lives would not bear. Such a snow-ball he might easily gather by rolling through those cold and dark provinces of ignorance and lewdness, where on a sudden he became so numerous. He imputes that to God's protection, which, to them who persist in a bad cause, is either his long-suffering, or his hardening; and that to wholesome chastisement, which were the gradual beginnings of a severe punishment. For if neither God nor nature put civil power in the hands of any whomsoever, but to a lawful end, and commands our obedience to the authority of law only, not to the tyrannical force of any person; and if the laws of our land have placed the sword in no man's hand, so much as to unsheath against a foreign enemy, much less upon the native people, but have placed it in that elective body of the parliament, to whom the making, repealing, judging, and interpreting of law itself was also committed, as was fittest, so long as we intended to be a free nation, and not the slaves of one man's will; then was the king himself disobedient and rebellious to that law by which he reigned; and by authority of parliament to raise arms against him in defence of law and liberty, we do not only think, but believe and know was justifiable both "by the word of God, the laws of the land, and all lawful oaths;" and they who sided with him fought against all these.

The same allegations which he uses for himself and his party, may as well fit any tyrant in the world: for let the parliament be called a faction when the king pleases, and that no law must be made or changed either civil or religious, because no law will content all sides, then must be made or changed no law at all, but what a tyrant, be he protestant or papist, thinks fit. Which tyrannous assertion forced upon us by the sword, he who fights against, and dies fighting, if his other sins overweigh not, dies a Martyr undoubtedly both of the faith and of the commonwealth: and I hold it not as the opinion, but as the full belief and persuasion of far holier and wiser men than Parasitic Preachers: Who, without their dinner-doctrine, know that neither King, Law, civil Oaths, or Religion, was ever established without the parliament: and their power is the same to abrogate as to establish: neither is any thing to be thought established, which that house declares to be abolished. Where the parliament sits, there inseparably sits the king, there the laws, there our oaths, and whatsoever can be civil in religion. They who fought for the parliament, in the truest sense fought for all these; who fought for the king divided from his parliament, fought for the shadow of a king against all these; and for things that were not, as if they were established. It were a thing monstrously absurd and contradictory to give the parliament a legislative power, and then to upbraid them for transgressing old establishments.

But the king and his party having lost in this quarrel their heaven upon earth, begin to make great reckoning of eternal life, and at an easy rate in forma pauperis canonize one another into heaven; he them in his book, they him in the portraiture before his book: but as was said before, stage-work will not do it, much less the justness of their cause, wherein most frequently they died in a brutish fierceness, with oaths and other damning words in their mouths; as if such had been all the oaths they fought for: which undoubtedly sent them full sail on another voyage than to heaven. In the mean while they to whom God gave victory, never brought to the king at Oxford the state of their Consciences, that he should presume without confession, more than a pope presumes, to tell abroad what conflicts and accusations men, whom he never spoke with, have in their own thoughts. We never read of any English king but one that was a confessor, and his name was Edward; yet sure it passed his skill to know thoughts, as this king takes upon him. But they who will not stick to slander men's inward consciences, which they can neither see nor know, much less will care to slander outward actions, which they pretend to see, though with senses never so vitiated.

To

To judge of his condition conquered, and the manner of dying on that side, by the sober men that chose it, would be his small advantage: it being most notorious, that they who were hottest in his cause, the most of them were men oftener drunk, than by their good-will sober, and very many of them so fought and so died.

And that the Conscience of any man should grow suspicious, or be now convicted by any pretensions in the parliament, which are now proved false and unintended, there can be no just cause. For neither did they ever pretend to establish his throne without our liberty and religion, nor religion without the word of God, nor to judge of laws by their being established, but to establish them by their being good and necessary.

He tells the world "he often prayed that all on his side might be as faithful to God and their own souls, as to him." But kings above all other men have in their hands not to pray only, but to do. To make that prayer effectual, he should have governed as well as prayed. To pray and not to govern, is for a monk, and not a king. Till then he might be well assured they were more faithful to their lust and rapine than to him.

In the wonted predication of his own virtues he goes on to tell us, that to "conquer he never desired, but only to restore the laws and liberties of his people." It had been happy then he had known at last, that by force to restore laws abrogated by the legislative parliament, is to conquer absolutely both them and law itself. And for our liberties, none ever oppressed them more, both in peace and war; first like a master by his arbitrary power, next as an enemy by hostile invasion.

And if his best friends feared him, and "he himself, in the temptation of an absolute conquest," it was not only pious but friendly in the parliament, both to fear him and resist him; since their not yielding, was the only means to keep him out of that temptation wherein he doubted his own strength.

He takes himself to be "guilty in this war of nothing else, but of confirming the power of some men:" Thus all along he signifies the parliament, whom to have settled by an act he counts to be his only guiltiness. So well he knew that to continue a parliament, was to raise a war against himself; what were his actions then, and his government the while? For never was it heard in all our story, that parliaments made war on their kings, but on their tyrants; whose modesty and gratitude was more wanting to the parliament, than theirs to any of such kings.

What he yielded was his fear; what he denied was his obstinacy. Had he yielded more, fear might perchance have saved him; had he granted less, his obstinacy had perhaps the sooner delivered us.

"To review the occasions of this war," will be to them never too late, who would be warned by his example from the like evils: but to wish only a happy conclusion, will never expiate the fault of his unhappy beginnings. It is true, on our side the sins of our lives not seldom fought against us: but on their side, besides those, the grand sin of their cause.

How can it be otherwise, when he desires here most unreasonably, and indeed sacrilegiously, that we should be subject to him, though not further, yet as far as all of us may be subject to God, to whom this expression leaves no precedence? He who desires from men as much obedience and subjection, as we may all pay to God, desires not less than to be a God: a sacrilege far worse than meddling with the Bishop's lands, as he esteems it.

His prayer is a good prayer and a glorious; but glorying is not good, if it know not that a little leaven leavens the whole lump. It should have purged out the leaven of untruth in telling God that the blood of his subjects by him shed, was in his just and necessary defence. Yet this is remarkable; God hath here so ordered his prayer, that as his own lips acquitted the parliament, not long before his death, of all the blood spilt in this war, so now his prayer unwittingly draws it upon himself. For God imputes not to any man

the blood he spills in a just cause; and no man ever begged his not imputing of that which he in his justice could not impute: so that now whether purposely, or unawares, he hath confessed both to God and man the blood-guiltiness of all this war to lie upon his own head.

XX. Upon the Reformation of the Times.

THIS chapter cannot punctually be answered without more repetitions than now can be excusable: which perhaps have already been more humoured than was needful. As it presents us with nothing new, so with his exceptions against reformation pitifully old and tattered with continual using; not only in his book, but in the words and writings of every papist and popish king. On the scene he thrusts out first an antimasque of two bugbears, Novelty and Perturbation; that the ill looks and noise of those two, may as long as possible drive off all endeavours of a reformation. Thus sought pope Adrian, by representing the like vain terrors, to divert and dissipate the zeal of those reforming princes of the age before in Germany. And if we credit Latimer's sermons, our papists here in England pleaded the same dangers and inconveniencies against that which was reformed by Edward the Sixth. Whereas if those fears had been available, christianity itself had never been received. Which Christ foretold us, would not be admitted without the censure of novelty and many great commotions. These therefore are not to deter us.

He grants reformation to be "a good work", and confesses "what the indulgence of times and corruption of manners might have depraved." So did the fore-mentioned pope, and our grandfire papists in this realm. Yet all of them agree in one song with this here, that "they are sorry to see so little regard had to laws established, and the religion settled."

"Popular compliance, dissolution of all order and government in the church, schisms, opinions, undecencies, confusions, sacrilegious invasions, contempt of the clergy and their liturgy, diminution of princes;" all these complaints are to be read in the messages and speeches almost of every legate from the pope to those states and cities which began reformation. From whence he either learned the same pretences, or had them naturally in him from the same spirit. Neither was there ever so sincere a reformation that hath escaped these clamours.

He offered a "Synod or convocation rightly chosen." So offered all those popish kings heretofore; a course the most unsatisfactory, as matters have been long carried, and found by experience in the church liable to the greatest fraud and packing; no solution, or redress of evil, but an increase rather; detested therefore by Nazianzen, and some other of the fathers. And let it be produced, what good hath been done by synods from the first times of reformation.

Not to justify what enormities the vulgar may commit in the rudeness of their zeal, we need but only instance how he bemoans "the pulling down of crosses" and other superstitious monuments, as the effect "of a popular and deceitful Reformation." How little this favours of a protestant, is too easily perceived.

What he charges in defect of "piety, charity, and morality," hath been also charged by papists upon the best reformed churches; not as if they the accusers were not tenfold more to be accused, but out of their malignity to all endeavour of amendment; as we know who accused to God the sincerity of Job; an accusation of all others the most easy, whenas their lives not any mortal man so excellent, who in these things is not always deficient. But the infirmities of best men, and the scandals of mixed hypocrites in all times of reforming, whose bold intrusion covets to be ever seen in things most sacred as they are most specious, can lay no just blemish upon the integrity of others, much less upon the purpose

purpose of reformation itself. Neither can the evil doings of some be the excuse of our delaying or deserting that duty to the church, which for no respect of times or carnal policies can be at any time unseasonable.

He tells with great shew of piety what kind of persons public Reformers ought to be, and what they ought to do. It is strange that in above twenty years, the church growing still worse and worse under him, he could neither be as he bids others be, nor do, as he pretends here so well to know; nay, which is worst of all, after the greatest part of his reign spent in neither knowing nor doing aught toward a reformation either in church or state, should spend the residue in hindring those by a seven years war, whom it concerned with his consent or without it, to do their parts in that great performance.

'Tis true that the "method of reforming" may well subsist without "perturbation of the state;" but that it falls out otherwise for the most part, is the plain text of scripture. And if by his own rule he had allowed us to "fear God first," and the king in due order, our allegiance might have still followed our religion in a fit subordination. But if Christ's kingdom be taken for the true discipline of the church, and by his Kingdom be meant the violence he used against it, and to uphold an antichristian hierarchy, then sure enough it is, that Christ's kingdom could not be set up without pulling down his: and they were best christians who were least subject to him. Christ's Government, out of question meaning it prelatial, he thought would confirm his: and this was that which overthrew it.

He professes "to own his kingdom from Christ, and to desire to rule for his glory, and the church's good." The pope and the king of Spain profess every where as much; and both his practice and all his reasonings, all his enmity against the true church we see hath been the same with theirs, since the time that in his letter to the pope he assured them both of his full compliance. "But evil beginnings never bring forth good conclusions:" they are his own words, and he ratified them by his own ending. To the pope he engaged himself to hazard life and estate for the Roman religion, whether in compliment he did it, or in earnest; and God, who stood nearer than he for complimenting minded, writ down those words; that according to his resolution, so it should come to pass. He prays against "his hypocrisy and pharisaical washings," a prayer to him most pertinent, but choaks it straight with other words which pray him deeper into his old errors and delusions.

XXI. Upon his Letters taken and divulged.

THE king's letters taken at the battle of Naseby, being of greatest importance to let the people see what faith there was in all his promises and solemn protestations, were transmitted to public view by special order of the parliament. They discovered his good affection to the papists and Irish rebels, the strict intelligence he held, the pernicious and dishonourable peace he made with them, not solicited, but rather soliciting, which by all invocations that were holy he had in public abjured. They revealed his endeavours to bring in foreign forces, Irish, French, Dutch, Lorrainers, and our old invaders the Danes upon us, besides his subtleties and mysterious arts in treating: to sum up all, they shewed him governed by a woman. All which, though suspected vehemently before, and from good grounds believed, yet by him and his adherents peremptorily denied, were by the opening of that cabinet visible to all men under his own hand.

The parliament therefore, to clear themselves of aspersing him without cause, and that the people might no longer be abused and cajoled, as they call it, by falsities and court-impudence, in matters of so high concernment, to let them know on what terms their duty stood, and the kingdom's peace, conceived it most expedient and necessary that those letters should be made public. This the king affirms was by them done without "honour and civility:" words, which if they contain not in them, as in the language of a courtier most commonly they do not, more of substance and reality than compliment, ceremony,

court-fawning and dissembling, enter not I suppose further than the ear into any wise man's consideration. Matters were not then between a parliament and a king their enemy in that state of trifling, as to observe those superficial vanities. But if honour and civility mean, as they did of old, discretion, honesty, prudence, and plain truth, it will be then maintained against any sect of those Cabalists, that the parliament in doing what they did with those letters, could suffer in their honour and civility no diminution. The reasons are already heard.

And that it is with none more familiar than with kings, to transgress the bounds of all honour and civility, there should not want examples good store, if brevity would permit; in point of letters, this one shall suffice. The Dutchess of Burgundy, and heir of Duke Charles, had promised to her subjects that she intended no otherwise to govern, than by advice of the three estates; but to Lewis the French king had written letters that she had resolved to commit wholly the managing of her affairs to four persons whom she named. The three estates, not doubting the sincerity of her princely word, send ambassadors to Lewis, who then besieged Arras belonging to the dukes of Burgundy. The king taking hold of this occasion to set them at division among themselves, questioned their credence; which when they offered to produce, with their instructions, he not only shews them the private letter of their dutchess, but gives it them to carry home, wherewith to affront her; which they did, she denying it stoutly, till they spreading it before her face in a full assembly, convicted her of an open lye. Which, although Comines the historian much blames, as a deed too harsh and dishonourable in them who were subjects, and not at war with their princess, yet to his master Lewis, who first divulged those letters, to the open shaming of that young governess, he imputes no incivility or dishonour at all, although betraying a certain confidence reposed by that letter in his royal secrecy.

With much more reason then may letters not intercepted only, but won in battle from an enemy, be made public to the best advantages of them that win them, to the discovery of such important truth or falshood. Was it not more dishonourable in himself to feign suspicions and jealousies, which we first found among those letters, touching the chastity of his mother, thereby to gain assistance from the king of Denmark, as in vindication of his sister? The damsel of Burgundy at sight of her own letter was soon blank, and more ingenuous than to stand out-facing; but this man, whom nothing will convince, thinks by talking world without end to make good his integrity and fair dealing, contradicted by his own hand and seal. They who can pick nothing out of them but phrases, shall be counted Bees: they that discern further both there and here, that constancy to his wife is set in place before laws and religion, are in his naturalities no better than Spiders.

He would work the people to a persuasion, that "if he be miserable, they cannot be happy." What should hinder them? Were they all born twins of Hippocrates with him and his fortune, one birth one burial? It were a nation miserable indeed, not worth the name of a nation, but a race of idiots, whose happiness and welfare depended upon one man. The happiness of a nation consists in true religion, piety, justice, prudence, temperance, fortitude, and the contempt of avarice and ambition. They in whomsoever these virtues dwell eminently, need not kings to make them happy, but are the architects of their own happiness; and whether to themselves or others are not less than kings. But in him, which of these virtues were to be found, that might extend to the making happy, or the well-governing of so much as his own household, which was the most licentious and ill-governed in the whole land?

But the opening of his letters was designed by the parliament "to make all Reconciliation desperate." Are the lives of so many good and faithful men that died for the freedom of their country, to be so slighted, as to be forgotten in a stupid reconciliation without justice done them? What he fears not by war and slaughter, should we fear to make desperate by opening his letters? Which fact he would parallel with Cham's revealing of his
father's

father's nakedness : when he at that time could be no way esteemed the Father of his Country, but the destroyer ; nor had he ever before merited that former title.

“ He thanks God he cannot only bear this with patience, but with charity forgive the doers.” Is not this meer mockery, to thank God for what he can do, but will not ? For is it patience to impute Barbarism and Inhumanity to the opening of an enemy's letter, or is it charity to clothe them with curses in his prayer, whom he hath forgiven in his discourse ? In which prayer, to shew how readily he can return good for evil to the parliament, and that if they take away his coat, he can let them have his cloak also ; for the dismantling of his letters he wishes “ they may be covered with the cloak of confusion.” Which I suppose they do resign with much willingness, both livery, badge, and cognizance, to them who chose rather to be his servants and vassals, than to stand against him for the liberty of their country.

XXII. Upon his going to the Scots.

THE king's coming in, whether to the Scots or English, deserved no thanks : for Necessity was his Counsellor ; and that he hated them both alike, his expressions every where manifest. Some say his purpose was to have come to London, till hearing how strictly it was proclaimed, that no man should conceal him, he diverted his course. But that had been a frivolous excuse : and besides, he himself rehearsing the consultations had, before he took his journey, shews us clearly that he was determined to adventure “ upon their loyalty who first began his troubles.” And that the Scots had notice of it before, hath been long since brought to light. What prudence there could be in it, no man can imagine ; malice there might be, by raising new jealousies to divide friends. For besides his diffidence of the English, it was no small dishonour that he put upon them, when rather than yield himself to the parliament of England, he yielded to a hireling army of Scots in England, paid for their service here, not in Scotch coin, but in English silver ; nay, who from the beginning of these troubles, what with brotherly assistance, and what with monthly pay, have defended their own liberty and consciences at our charge. However it was a hazardous and rash journey taken “ to resolve riddles in mens loyalty,” who had more reason to mistrust the riddle of such a disguised yielding ; and to put himself in their hands whose loyalty was a riddle to him, was not the course to be resolved of it, but to tempt it. What Providence denied to force, he thought it might grant to fraud, which he stiles Prudence : but providence was not cozened with disguises, neither outward nor inward.

To have known “ his greatest danger in his supposed safety, and his greatest safety in his supposed danger” was to him a fatal riddle never yet resolved ; wherein rather to have employed his main-skill had been much more to his preservation.

Had he “ known when the game was lost,” it might have saved much contest ; but the way to give over fairly, was not to slip out of open war into a new disguise. He lays down his arms, but not his wiles ; nor all his arms ; for in obstinacy he comes no less armed than ever, Cap-a-pé. And what were they but wiles, continually to move for treaties, and yet to persist the same man, and to fortify his mind before-hand, still purposing to grant no more than what seemed good to that violent and lawless triumvirate within him, under the falsified names of his reason, honour, and conscience, the whole circulating dance of his shifts and evasions ?

The words of a king, as they are full of power, in the authority and strength of law, so like Sampson without the strength of that Nazarite's lock, they have no more power in them than the words of another man.

He adores reason as Domitian did Minerva, and calls her the Divinest Power, thereby to intimate as if at reasoning, as at his own weapon, no man were so able as himself.

Might

Might we be so happy as to know where these monuments of his reason may be seen; for in his actions and his writing they appear as thinly as could be expected from the meanest parts, bred up in the midst of so many ways extraordinary to know something. He who reads his talk, would think he had left Oxford not without mature deliberation: yet his prayer confesses that "he knew not what to do." Thus is verified that psalm; "he poureth contempt upon princes, and causeth them to wander in the wilderness where there is no way," Psal. 107.

XXIII. Upon the Scots delivering the King to the English.

THAT the Scots in England should "sell their king," as he himself here affirms, and for a "price so much above that," which the covetousness of Judas was contented with to sell our Saviour, is so foul an infamy and dishonour cast upon them, as befits none to vindicate but themselves. And it were but friendly counsel to wish them beware the son, who comes among them with a firm belief that they sold his father. The rest of this chapter he sacrifices to the echo of his conscience, out-babbling creeds and ave's, glorying in his resolute obstinacy, and as it were triumphing how "evident it is now, that not evil counsellors," but he himself hath been the author of all our troubles. Herein only we shall disagree to the world's end, while he who fought so manifestly to have annihilated all our laws and liberties, hath the confidence to persuade us that he hath fought and suffered all this while in their defence.

But he who neither by his own letters and commissions under hand and seal, nor by his own actions held as in a mirror before his face, will be convinced to see his faults, can much less be won upon by any force of words, neither he, nor any that take after him; who in that respect are no more to be disputed with, than they who deny principles. No question then, but the parliament did wisely in their decree at last, to make no more addressees. For how unalterable his will was, that would have been our Lord, how utterly averse from the parliament and reformation during his confinement, we may behold in this chapter. But to be ever answering fruitless repetitions, I should become liable to answer for the same myself. He borrows David's psalms, as he charges the assembly of divines in his twentieth discourse, "To have set forth old catechisms and confessions of faith new drest;" had he borrowed David's heart, it had been much the holier theft. For such kind of borrowing as this, if it be not bettered by the borrower, among good authors is accounted Plagiarism. However, this was more tolerable than Pamela's prayer, stolen out of Sir Philip.

XXIV. Upon the denying him the attendance of his chaplains.

A Chaplain is a thing so diminutive and inconsiderable, that how he should come here among matters of so great concernment to take such room up in the discourses of a prince, if it be not wondered, is to be smiled at. Certainly by me, so mean an argument shall not be written; but I shall huddle him, as he does prayers. The scripture owns no such order, no such function in the church; and the church not owning them, they are left, for aught I know, to such a further examining as the sons of Sceva the Jew met with. Bishops or presbyters we know, and deacons we know, but what are chaplains? In state perhaps they may be listed among the upper serving-men of some great household, and be admitted to some such place, as may stifle them the sewers, or the yeomen-ushers of devotion, where the master is too resty, or too rich to say his own prayers, or to bless his own table. Wherefore should the parliament then take such implements of the court cup-board into their consideration? They knew them to have been the main corrupters at the king's elbow; they knew the king to have been always
their

their most attentive scholar and imitator, and of a child to have sucked from them and their closet-work all his impotent principles of tyranny and superstition. While therefore they had any hope left of his reclaiming, these sowers of malignant tares they kept afunder from him, and sent to him such of the ministers and other zealous persons as they thought were best able to instruct him, and to convert him. What could religion herself have done more, to the saving of a soul? But when they found him past cure, and that he to himself was grown the most evil counsellor of all, they denied him not his chaplains, as many as were fitting, and some of them attended him, or else were at his call to the very last. Yet here he makes more lamentation for the want of his chaplains, than superstitious Micah did to the Danites, who had taken away his household priest: "Ye have taken away my Gods which I made, and the priest, and what have I more?" And perhaps the whole story of Micah might square not unfitly to this argument: "Now know I," saith he, "that the Lord will do me good, seeing I have a Levite to my priest." Micah had as great a care that his priest should be Mosaical, as the king had that his should be Apostolical; yet both in an error touching their priests. Household and private orisons were not to be officiated by priests; for neither did public prayer appertain only to their office. Kings heretofore, David, Solomon, and Jehoshaphat, who might not touch the priesthood, yet might pray in public, yea in the temple, while the priests themselves stood and heard. What ailed this king then, that he could not chew his own mattins without the priest's Ore tenus? Yet is it like he could not pray at home, who can here publish a whole prayer-book of his own, and signifies in some part of this chapter almost as good a mind to be a priest himself, as Micah had to let his son be! There was doubtless therefore some other matter in it, which made him so desirous to have his chaplains about him, who were not only the contrivers, but very oft the instruments also of his designs.

The ministers which were sent him, no marvel he endured not; for they preached repentance to him: the others gave him easy confession, easy absolution, nay, strengthened his hands, and hardened his heart, by applauding him in his wilful ways. To them he was an Ahab, to these a Constantine; it must follow then, that they to him were as unwelcome as Eliah was to Ahab, these as dear and pleasing as Amaziah the priest of Bethel was to Jeroboam. These had learnt well the lesson that would please; "Prophecy not against Bethel, for it is the king's chapel, the king's court;" and had taught the king to say of those ministers which the parliament had sent, "Amos hath conspired against me, the land is not able to bear all his words."

Returning to our first parallel, the king looked upon his prelates, "as orphans under the sacrilegious eyes of many rapacious reformers:" and there was as great fear of sacrilege between Micah and his mother, till with their holy treasure, about the loss whereof there was such cursing, they made a graven and a molten image, and got a priest of their own. To let go his criticizing about the "found of prayers, imperious, rude, or passionate" modes of his own devising, we are in danger to fall again upon the flats and shallows of liturgy. Which if I should repeat again, would turn my answers into Responsories, and beget another liturgy, having too much of one already.

This only I shall add, that if the heart, as he alledges, cannot safely "join with another man's extemporal sufficiency," because we know not so exactly what they mean to say; then those public prayers made in the temple by those forenamed kings, and by the apostles in the congregation, and by the ancient christians for above three hundred years before liturgies came in, were with the people made in vain.

After he hath acknowledged that kings heretofore prayed without chaplains, even publickly in the temple itself, and that every "private believer is invested with a royal priesthood; yet like one that relished not what he "tasted of the heavenly gift, and the good word of God," whose name he so confidently takes into his mouth, he frames to himself impertinent and vain reasons why he should rather pray by the officiating mouth
of

of a closet-chaplain. "Their prayers," saith he, "are more prevalent, they flow from minds more enlightened, from affections less distracted." Admit this true, which is not, this might be something said as to their prayers for him, but what avails it to their praying with him? If his own mind "be incumbered with secular affairs, what helps it his particular prayer, though the mind of his chaplain be not wandring, either after new preferment, or his dinner? The fervency of one man in prayer, cannot supererogate for the coldness of another; neither can his spiritual defects in that duty be made out in the acceptance of God by another man's abilities. Let him endeavour to have more light in himself, and not to walk by another man's lamp, but to get oil into his own. Let him cast from him, as in a christian warfare, that secular incumbrance which either distracts or overloads him; his load else will never be the less heavy, because another man's is light. Thus these pious flourishes and colours examined thoroughly, are like the apples of Asphaltis, appearing goodly to the sudden eye, but look well upon them, or at least but touch them, and they turn into cinders.

In his prayer he remembers what "voices of joy and gladness" there were in his chapel, "God's house," in his opinion, between the singing-men and the organs; and this was "unity of spirit in the bond of peace;" the vanity, superstition, and misdevotion of which place, was a scandal far and near: Wherein so many things were sung, and prayed in those songs which were not understood; and yet he who makes a difficulty how the people can join their hearts to extemporal prayers, though distinctly heard and understood, makes no question how they should join their hearts in unity to songs not understood!

I believe that God is no more moved with a prayer elaborately penned, than men truly charitable, are moved with the penned speech of a beggar.

Finally, O ye ministers, read here what work he makes among your gally-pots, your Balms and Cordials; and not only your sweet Sippets in widows houses, but the huge gobbets wherewith he charges you, to have devoured houses and all; the "houses of your brethren, your king, and your God." Cry him up for a saint in your pulpits, while he cries you down for atheists into hell.

XXV. Upon his penitential Meditations and Vows at Holmby.

IT is not hard for any man who hath a bible in his hands, to borrow good words and holy sayings in abundance; but to make them his own, is a work of grace only from above. He borrows here many penitential verses out of David's psalms. So did many among those Israelites, who had revolted from the true worship of God, "invent to themselves instruments of music like David," and probably psalms also like his; and yet the prophet Amos complains heavily against them. But to prove how short this is of true repentance, I will recite the penitence of others, who have repented, in words not borrowed, but their own, and yet by the doom of scripture itself are judged reprobates.

"Cain said unto the Lord, My iniquity is greater than I can bear: behold thou hast driven me this day from the face of the earth, and from thy face shall I be hid.

"And when Esau heard the words of his father, he cried with an exceeding bitter cry, and said, bless me, even me also, O my father; yet found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears, Heb. 12.

"And Pharaoh said to Moses, the Lord is righteous, I and my people are wicked; I have sinned against the Lord your God; and against you.

"And Balaam said, Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his.

And

"And Saul said to Samuel, I have sinned, for I have transgressed the commandment of the Lord; yet honour me now, I pray thee, before the elders of my people.

"And when Ahab heard the words of Eliah, he rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his flesh, and fasted, and lay in sackcloth, and went softly.

"Jehoram also rent his clothes, and the people looked, and behold he had sackcloth upon his flesh;" yet in the very act of his humiliation he could say, "God do so, and more also to me, if the head of Elisha shall stand on him this day.

"Therefore saith the Lord, they have not cried unto me with their heart, when they howled upon their beds. They return, but not to the most high. Hosea vii.

"And Judas said, I have sinned, in that I have betrayed innocent blood.

"And Simon Magus said, Pray ye to the Lord for me, that none of these things come upon me.

All these took the pains both to confess and to repent in their own words, and many of them in their own tears, not in David's. But transported with the vain ostentation of imitating David's language, not his life, observe how he brings a curse upon himself and his father's house (God so disposing it) by his usurped and ill-imitated prayer, "Let thy anger I beseech thee be against me and my father's house; as for these sheep, what have they done?" For if David indeed sinned in numbring the people, of which fault he in earnest made that confession, and acquitted the whole people from the guilt of that sin; then doth this king, using the same words, bear witness against himself to be the guilty person, and either in his soul and conscience here acquits the parliament and the people, or else abuses the words of David, and dissembles grossly even to the face of God; which is apparent in the very next line; wherein he accuses even the church itself to God, as if she were the church's enemy, for having overcome his tyranny by the powerful and miraculous might of God's manifest arm: For to other strength in the midst of our divisions and disorders, who can attribute our victories? Thus had this miserable man no worse enemies to solicit and mature his own destruction, from the hastened sentence of divine justice, than the obdurate curses which proceeded against himself out of his own mouth.

Hitherto his meditations, now his vows, which as the vows of hypocrites use to be, are most commonly absurd, and some wicked. Jacob vowed that God should be his God, if he granted him but what was necessary to perform that vow, life and subsistence: but the obedience proffered here is nothing so cheap. He who took so heinously to be offered nineteen propositions from the parliament, capitulates here with God almost in as many articles.

"If he will continue that light," or rather that darkness of the gospel, which is among his prelates, settle their luxuries, and make them gorgeous bishops;

If he will "restore" the grievances and mischiefs of those obsolete and popish laws, which the parliament without his consent hath abrogated, and will suffer justice to be executed according to his sense;

"If he will suppress the many schisms in church," to contradict himself in that which he hath foretold must and shall come to pass, and will remove reformation as the greatest schism of all, and factions in the state, by which he means in every leaf the parliament;

If he will "restore him" to his negative voice and the militia, as much as to say, to arbitrary power, which he wrongfully avers to be the "Right of his Predecessors;"

"If he will turn the hearts of his people" to their old cathedral and parochial service in the liturgy, and their passive obedience to the king;

"If he will quench" the army, and withdraw our forces from withstanding the piracy of Rupert, and the plotted Irish invasion;

"If he will bless him with the freedom" of Bishops again in the house of peers, and of fugitive delinquents in the house of commons, and deliver the honour of parliament

into his hands, from the most natural and due protection of the people, that entrusted them with the dangerous enterprize of being faithful to their country against the rage and malice of his tyrannous opposition ;

“ If he will keep him from that great offence” of following the counsel of his parliament, and enacting what they advise him to, which in all reason, and by the known law and oath of his coronation he ought to do, and not to call that Sacrilege which necessity through the continuance of his own civil war hath compelled them to ; necessity, which made David eat the shew-bread, made Ezekiah take all the silver which was found in God’s house, and cut off the gold which overlaid those doors and pillars, and give it to Senacherib ; necessity, which oft-times made the primitive church to sell her sacred utensils, even to the communion-chalice ;

“ If he will restore him to a capacity of glorifying him by doing” that both in church and state, which must needs dishonour and pollute his name ;

“ If he will bring him again with peace, honour and safety to his chief city,” without repenting, without satisfying for the blood spilt, only for a few politic concessions, which are as good as nothing ;

“ If he will put again the sword into his hand, to punish” those that have delivered us, and to protect delinquents against the justice of parliament ;

Then, if it be possible to reconcile contradictions, he will praise him by displeasing him, and serve him by diserving him.

“ His glory,” in the gaudy copes and painted windows, mitres, rochets, altars, and the chanted service-book, “ shall be dearer to him” than the establishing his Crown in righteousness, and the spiritual power of religion.

“ He will pardon those that have offended him in particular,” but there shall want no subtle ways to be even with them upon another score of their supposed offences against the commonwealth ; whereby he may at once affect the glory of a seeming justice, and destroy them pleasantly, while he feigns to forgive them as to his own particular, and outwardly bewails them.

These are the conditions of his treating with God, to whom he bates nothing of what he stood upon with the parliament : as if commissions of array could deal with him also. But of all these conditions, as it is now evident in our eyes, God accepted none, but that final petition which he so oft, no doubt but by the secret judgment of God, importunes against his own head ; praying God, “ That his mercies might be so toward him, as his resolutions of truth and peace were toward his people.” It follows then, God having cut him off, without granting any of these mercies, that his resolutions were as feigned, as his vows are frustrate.

XXVI. Upon the Army’s surprisal of the King at Holmby.

TO give account to royalists what was done with their vanquished king, yielded up into our hands, is not to be expected from them whom God hath made his conquerors. And for brethren to debate and rip up their falling out in the ear of a common enemy, thereby making him the judge, or at least the well-pleased auditor of their disagreement, is neither wise nor comely. To the king therefore, were he living, or to his party yet remaining, as to this action, there belongs no answer. Emulations, all men know are incident among military men, and are, if they exceed not, pardonable. But some of the former army, eminent enough for their own martial deeds, and prevalent in the house of commons, touched with envy to be so far outdone by a new model which they contemned, took advantage of presbyterian and independent names, and the virulence of some ministers, to raise disturbance. And the war being then ended, thought slightly to have discarded them, who had faithfully done the work, without their

their due pay, and the reward of their invincible valour. But they who had the sword yet in their hands, disdaining to be made the first objects of ingratitude and oppression, after all that expence of their blood for justice and the common liberty, seized upon the king their prisoner, whom nothing but their matchless deeds had brought so low as to surrender up his person: though he, to stir up new discord, chose rather to give up himself a captive to his own country-men who less had won him. This in likelihood might have grown to some height of mischief; partly through the strife which was kindling between our elder and our younger warriors, but chiefly through the seditious tongues of some false ministers, more zealous against schisms, than against their own simony and pluralities, or watchful of the common enemy, whose subtle insinuations had got so far in among them, as with all diligence to blow the coals. But it pleased God not to embroil and put to confusion his whole people for the perverseness of a few. The growth of our dissension was either prevented, or soon quieted; the enemy soon deceived of his rejoicing, and the king especially disappointed of not the meanest morsel that his hope presented him, to ruin us by our division. And being now so nigh the end, we may the better be at leisure to stay a while, and hear him commenting upon his own captivity.

He saith of his surprisal, that it was a "motion eccentric and irregular." What then? his own allusion from the celestial bodies, puts us in mind that irregular motions may be necessary on earth sometimes, as well as constantly in heaven. That is not always best which is most regular to written law. Great worthies heretofore, by disobeying law, oft-times have saved the commonwealth; and the law afterward by firm decree hath approved that planetary motion, that unblameable exorbitancy in them.

He means no good to either independent or presbyterian, and yet his parable, like that of Balaam, is over-ruled to portend them good, far beside his intention. Those Twins that strove enclosed in the womb of Rebecca, were the seed of Abraham; the younger undoubtedly gained the heavenly birth-right; the elder, though supplanted in his simile, shall yet no question find a better portion than Esau found, and far above his uncircumcised prelates.

He censures, and in censuring seems to hope it will be an ill omen, that they who build Jerusalem divide their tongues and hands. But his hope failed him with his example; for that there were divisions both of tongues and hands at the building of Jerusalem, the story would have certified him; and yet the work prospered: and if God will, so may this, notwithstanding all the craft and malignant wiles of Sanballat and Tobiah, adding what fuel they can to our dissensions; or the indignity of his comparison, that likens us to those seditious Zealots whose intestine fury brought destruction to the last Jerusalem.

It being now no more in his hand to be revenged on his opposers, he seeks to satiate his fancy with the imagination of some revenge upon them from above; and like one who in a drowth observes the sky, sits and watches when any thing will drop, that might solace him with the likeness of a punishment from heaven upon us; which he strait expounds how he pleases. No evil can befall the parliament or city, but he positively interprets it a judgment upon them for his sake; as if the very manuscript of God's judgments had been delivered to his custody and exposition. But his reading declares it well to be a false copy which he uses; dispensing often to his own bad deeds and successes the testimony of divine favour, and to the good deeds and successes of other men, divine wrath and vengeance. But to counterfeit the hand of God, is the boldest of all forgery: And he who without warrant, but his own fantastic surmise, takes upon him perpetually to unfold the secret and unsearchable mysteries of high providence, is likely for the most part to mistake and slander them; and approaches to the madness of those reprobate thoughts, that would wrest the sword of justice out of God's own hand, and employ it more justly in his own conceit. It was a small thing to contend with the parliament about the sole power of the militia, when we see him doing little less than laying hands on the weapons of God himself, which are his judgments, to wield and manage them

by the sway and bent of his own frail cogitations. Therefore "they that by tumults first occasioned the raising of armies, in his doom must needs be chastened by their own army for new tumults."

First, note here his confession, that those tumults were the first occasion of raising armies, and by consequence that he himself raised them first, against those supposed tumults. But who occasioned those tumults, or who made them so, being at first nothing more than the unarmed and peaceable concourse of people, hath been discussed already. And that those pretended tumults were chastized by their own army for new tumults, is not proved by a game at tic-tac with words; "tumults and armies, armies and tumults," but seems more like the method of a justice irrational than divine.

If the city were chastened by the army for new tumults, the reason is by himself set down evident and immediate, "their new tumults." With what sense can it be referred then to another far-fetched and imaginary cause that happened so many years before, and in his supposition only as a cause? Manlius defended the capitol and the Romans from their enemies the Gauls: Manlius for sedition afterward was by the Romans thrown headlong from the capitol; therefore Manlius was punished by divine justice for defending the capitol, because in that place punished for sedition, and by those whom he defended. This is his logic upon divine justice; and was the same before upon the death of Sir John Hotham. And here again, "such as were content to see him driven away by unsuppressed tumults, are now forced to fly to an army." Was this a judgment? was it not a mercy rather that they had a noble and victorious army so near at hand to fly to?

From God's justice, he comes down to man's justice. Those few of both houses, who at first withdrew with him from the vain pretence of tumults, were counted deserters; therefore those many must be also deserters who withdrew afterwards from real tumult: as if it were the place that made a parliament, and not the end and cause. Because it is denied that those were tumults from which the king made shew of being driven, is it therefore of necessity implied, that there could be never any tumults for the future? If some men fly in craft, may not other men have cause to fly in earnest? But mark the difference between their flight and his; they soon returned in safety to their places, he not till after many years, and then a captive to receive his punishment. So that their flying, whether the cause be considered or the event, or both, neither justified him, nor condemned themselves.

But he will needs have vengeance to pursue and overtake them; though to bring it in, it cost him an inconvenient and obnoxious comparison, "As the mice and rats overtook a German bishop." I would our mice and rats had been as orthodoxal here, and had so pursued all his bishops out of England; then vermin had rid away vermin, which now hath lost the lives of too many thousand honest men to do.

"He cannot but observe this divine justice, yet with sorry and pity." But sorrow and pity in a weak and over-mastered enemy, is looked upon no otherwise than as the ashes of his revenge burnt out upon itself; or as the damp of a cooled fury when we say, it gives. But in this manner to sit spelling and observing divine justice upon every accident and slight disturbance that may happen humanly to the affairs of men, is but another fragment of his broken revenge; and yet the shrewdest and the cunningest obloquy that can be thrown upon their actions. For if he can persuade men that the parliament and their cause is pursued with divine vengeance, he hath attained his end, to make all men forsake them, and think the worst that can be thought of them.

Nor is he only content to suborn divine justice in his censure of what is past, but he assumes the person of Christ himself to prognosticate over us what he wishes would come. So little is any thing or person sacred from him, no not in heaven, which he will not use, and put on, if it may serve him plausibly to wreck his spleen, or ease his mind upon the parliament. Although, if ever fatal blindness did both attend and punish wilfulness, if ever any enjoyed not comforts for neglecting counsel belonging to their peace,

it was in none more evidently brought to pass than in himself: and his predictions against the parliament and their adherents have for the most part been verified upon his own head, and upon his chief counsellors.

He concludes with high praises of the army. But praises in an enemy are superfluous, or smell of craft; and the army shall not need his praises, nor the parliament fare worse for his accusing prayers that follow. Wherein, as his charity can be no way comparable to that of Christ, so neither can his assurance that they whom he seems to pray for, in doing what they did against him, "knew not what they did." It was but arrogance therefore, and not charity, to lay such ignorance to others in the sight of God, till he himself had been infallible, like him whose peculiar words he overweeningly assumes.

XXVII. Intituled to the Prince of Wales.

WHAT the king wrote to his son, as a father, concerns not us; what he wrote to him as a king of England, concerns not him; God and the parliament having now otherwise disposed of England. But because I see it done with some artifice and labour, to possess the people that they might amend their present condition, by his or by his son's restoration, I shall shew point by point, that although the king had been re-installed to his desire, or that his son admitted, should observe exactly all his father's precepts, yet that this would be so far from conducing to our happiness, either as a remedy to the present distempers, or a prevention of the like to come, that it would inevitably throw us back again into all our past and fulfilled miseries; would force us to fight over again all our tedious wars, and put us to another fatal struggling for liberty and life, more dubious than the former. In which, as our success hath been no other than our cause; so it will be evident to all posterity, that his misfortunes were the mere consequence of his perverse judgment.

First, he argues from the experience of those troubles which both he and his son have had, to the improvement of their piety and patience: and by the way bears witness in his own words, that the corrupt education of his youth, which was but glanced at only in some former passages of this answer, was a thing neither of mean consideration, nor untruly charged upon him or his son: himself confessing here, that "court-delights are prone either to root up all true virtue and honour, or to be contented only with some leaves and withering formalities of them, without any real fruits tending to the public good" Which presents him still in his own words another Rehoboam, softened by a far worse court than Solomon's, and so corrupted by flatteries, which he affirms to be unseparable, to the overturning of all peace, and the loss of his own honour and kingdoms. That he came therefore thus bred up and nurtured to the throne, far worse than Rehoboam, unless he be of those who equalized his father to king Solomon, we have here his own confession. And how voluptuously, how idly reigning in the hands of other men, he either tyrannized or trifled away those seventeen years of peace, without care or thought, as if to be a king had been nothing else in his apprehension, but to eat and drink, and have his will, and take his pleasure; though there be who can relate his domestic life to the exactness of a diary, there shall be here no mention made. This yet we might have then foreseen, that he who spent his leisure so remissly and so corruptly to his own pleasing, would one day or other be worse busied and employed to our sorrow. And that he acted in good earnest what Rehoboam did but threaten, to make his little finger heavier than his father's loins, and to whip us with his two-twisted scorpions, both temporal and spiritual tyranny, all his kingdoms have felt. What good use he made afterwards of his adversity, both his impenitence and obstinacy to the end (for he was no Manasseh) and the sequel of these his meditated resolutions, abundantly express; retaining, commending, teaching to his son all those putrid and pernicious documents both of
state

state and of religion, instilled by wicked doctors, and received by him as in a vessel nothing better seasoned, which were the first occasion both of his own and all our miseries. And if he, in the best maturity of his years and understanding, made no better use to himself or others of his so long and manifold afflictions, either looking up to God, or looking down upon the reason of his own affairs; there can be no probability that his son, bred up, not in the soft effeminacies of a court only, but in the rugged and more boisterous licence of undisciplined camps and garrisons, for years unable to reflect with judgment upon his own condition, and thus ill instructed by his father, should give his mind to walk by any other rules than these bequeathed him as on the death-bed of his father, and as the choicest of all that experience, which his most serious observation and retirement in good or evil days, had taught him. David indeed, by suffering without just cause, learned that meekness and that wisdom by adversity, which made him much the fitter man to reign. But they who suffer as oppressors, tyrants, violators of law, and persecutors of reformation, without appearance of repenting; if they once get hold again of that dignity and power which they had lost, are but whetted and enraged by what they suffered, against those whom they look upon as them that caused their sufferings.

How he hath been "subject to the sceptre of God's word and spirit," though acknowledged to be the best government, and what his dispensation of civil power hath been, with what justice, and what honour to the public peace, it is but looking back upon the whole catalogue of his deeds, and that will be sufficient to remember us. "The cup of God's physic," as he calls it, what alteration it wrought in him to a firm healthfulness from any surfeit, or excess whereof the people generally thought him sick, if any man would go about to prove, we have his own testimony following here, that it wrought none at all.

First, he hath the same fixed opinion and esteem of his old Ephesian goddess, called the Church of England, as he had ever; and charges strictly his son after him to persevere in that anti-papal schism (for it is not much better) as that which will be necessary both for his soul's and the kingdom's peace. But if this can be any foundation of the kingdom's peace, which was the first cause of our distractions, let common sense be judge. It is a rule and principle worthy to be known by christians, that no scripture, no nor so much as any ancient creed, binds our faith, or our obedience to any Church whatsoever, denominated by a particular name; far less, if it be distinguished by a several government from that which is indeed catholic. No man was ever bid be subject to the Church of Corinth, Rome, or Asia, but to the Church without addition, as it held faithful to the rules of Scripture, and the government established in all places by the Apostles; which at first was universally the same in all churches and congregations; not differing or distinguished by the diversity of countries, territories, or civil bounds. That Church, that from the name of a distinct place, takes authority to set up a distinct faith or government, is a schism and faction, not a Church. It were an injury to condemn the papist of absurdity and contradiction, for adhering to his catholic Romish religion, if we, for the pleasure of a king and his politic considerations, shall adhere to a catholic English.

But suppose the Church of England were as it ought to be, how is it to us the safer by being so named and established, whenas that very name and establishment, by his contriving, or approbation, served for nothing else but to delude us and amuse us, while the Church of England was almost changed into the Church of Rome. Which as every man knows in general to be true, so the particular treaties and transactions tending to that conclusion, are at large discovered in a book intitled the "English Pope." But when the people, discerning these abuses, began to call for reformation, in order to which the parliament demanded of the king to un-establish that prelatical government, which without Scripture had usurped over us; strait, as Pharaoh accused of idleness the Israelites that sought leave to go and sacrifice to God, he lays faction to their charge. And that we may not hope to have ever any thing reformed in the Church either by him or his son, he fore-

forewarns him, "that the devil of rebellion doth most commonly turn himself into an angel of reformation:" and says enough to make him hate it, as the worst evils, and the bane of his crown: nay he counsels him to "let nothing seem little or despicable to him, so as not speedily and effectually to suppress errors and schisms." Whereby we may perceive plainly that our consciences were destined to the same servitude and persecution, if not worse than before, whether under him, or if it should so happen, under his son; who count all protestant Churches erroneous and schismatical, which are not episcopal. His next precept is concerning our civil liberties; which by his sole voice and predominant will must be circumscribed, and not permitted to extend a hand's breadth further than his interpretation of the laws already settled. And although all human laws are but the offspring of that frailty, that fallibility, and imperfection which was in their authors, whereby many laws, in the change of ignorant and obscure ages, may be found both scandalous, and full of grievance to their posterity that made them, and no law is further good, than mutable upon just occasion; yet if the removing of an old law, or the making of a new would save the kingdom, we shall not have it, unless his arbitrary voice will so far slacken the stiff curb of his prerogative, as to grant it us; who are as freeborn to make our own laws, as our fathers were who made these we have. Where are then the English liberties which we boast to have been left us by our progenitors? To that he answers, that "our liberties consist in the enjoyment of the fruits of our industry, and the benefit of those laws to which we ourselves have consented." First, for the enjoyment of those fruits which our industry and labours have made our own upon our own, what privilege is that above what the Turks, Jews and Moors enjoy under the Turkish monarchy? For without that kind of justice, which is also in Algiers, among thieves and pirates between themselves, no kind of government, no society, just or unjust, could stand; no combination or conspiracy could stick together: Which he also acknowledges in these words: "that if the crown upon his head be so heavy as to oppress the whole body, the weakness of inferior members cannot return any thing of strength, honour, or safety to the head; but that a necessary debilitation must follow." So that this liberty of the subject concerns himself and the subsistence of his own regal power in the first place, and before the consideration of any right belonging to the subject. We expect therefore something more, that must distinguish free government from slavish. But instead of that, this king, though ever talking and protesting as smooth as now, suffered it in his own hearing to be preached and pleaded without controul or check, by them whom he most favoured and upheld, that the subject had no property of his own goods, but that all was the king's right.

Next, for the "benefit of those laws to which we ourselves have consented," we never had it under him; for not to speak of laws ill executed, when the parliament, and in them the people, have consented to divers laws, and, according to our ancient rights, demanded them; he took upon him to have a negative will, as the transcendent and ultimate law above all our laws; and to rule us forcibly by laws to which we ourselves did not consent, but complained of. Thus these two heads, wherein the utmost of his allowance here will give our liberties leave to consist, the one of them shall be so far only made good to us, as may support his own interest and crown from ruin or debilitation; and so far Turkish vassals enjoy as much liberty under Mahomet and the Grand Signior: the other we neither yet have enjoyed under him, nor were ever like to do under the tyranny of a negative voice, which he claims above the unanimous consent and power of a whole nation virtually in the parliament:

In which negative voice to have been cast by the doom of war, and put to death by those who vanquished him in their own defence, he reckons to himself more than a negative Martyrdom. But martyrs bear witness to the truth, not to themselves. If I bear witness of myself, saith Christ, my witness is not true. He who writes himself Martyr by his own inscription, is like an ill painter, who by writing on the shapeless picture
which

which he hath drawn, is fain to tell passengers what shape it is; which else no man could imagine: no more than how a martyrdom can belong to him, who therefore dies for his religion because it is established. Certainly if Agrippa had turned christian, as he was once turning, and had put to death Scribes and Pharisees for observing the law of Moses, and refusing christianity, they had died a truer martyrdom. For those laws were established by God and Moses, these by no warrantable authors of religion, whose laws in all other best reformed churches are rejected. And if to die for an establishment of religion be martyrdom, then Romish priests executed for that, which had so many hundred years been established in this land, are no worse martyrs than he. Lastly, if to die for the testimony of his own conscience, be enough to make him martyr, what heretic dying for direct blasphemy, as some have done constantly, may not boast a martyrdom? As for the constitution or repeal of civil laws, that power lying only in the parliament, which he by the very law of his coronation was to grant them, not to debar them, nor to preserve a lesser law with the contempt and violation of a greater; it will conclude him not so much as in a civil and metaphorical sense to have died a martyr of our laws, but a plain transgressor of them. And should the parliament, endued with legislative power, make our laws, and be after to dispute them piece-meal with the reason, conscience, humour, passion, fancy, folly, obstinacy, or other ends of one man, whose sole word and will shall baffle and unmake what all the wisdom of a parliament hath been deliberately framing; what a ridiculous and contemptible thing a parliament would soon be, and what a base unworthy nation we, who boast our freedom, and send them with the manifest peril of their lives to preserve it, they who are not marked by destiny for slaves, may apprehend! In this servile condition to have kept us still under hatches, he both resolves here to the last, and so instructs his son.

As to those offered condescensions of "charitable connivance, or toleration," if we consider what went before, and what follows, they moulder into nothing. For, what with not suffering ever so little to seem a despicable schism, without effectual suppression, as he warned him before, and what with no opposition of law, government, or established religion to be permitted, which is his following proviso, and wholly within his own construction; what a miserable and suspected toleration, under spies and haunting promoters we should enjoy, is apparent. Besides that it is so far beneath the honour of a parliament and free nation, to beg and supplicate the godship of one frail man, for the bare and simple toleration of what they all consent to be most just, pious, and best pleasing to God, while that which is erroneous, unjust and mischievous in the church or state, shall by him alone against them all be kept up and established, and they censured the while for a covetous, ambitious, and sacrilegious faction.

Another bait to allure the people, is the charge he lays upon his son to be tender of them. Which if we should believe in part, because they are his herd, his cattle, the stock upon his ground, as he accounts them, whom to waste and destroy would undo himself, yet the inducement which he brings to move him, renders the motion itself something suspicious. For if princes need no palliations, as he tells his son, wherefore is it that he himself hath so often used them? Princes, of all other men, have not more change of raiment in their wardrobes, than variety of shifts and palliations in their solemn actings and pretences to the people.

To try next if he can ensnare the prime men of those who have opposed him, whom, more truly than his meaning was, he calls the "patrons and vindicators of the people," he gives out Indemnity, and offers Acts of Oblivion. But they who with a good conscience and upright heart did their civil duties in the sight of God, and in their several places, to resist tyranny and the violence of superstition banded both against them, he may be sure will never seek to be forgiven that, which may be justly attributed to their immortal praise; nor will assent ever to the guilty blotting out of those actions before men, by

which their faith assures them they chiefly stand approved, and are had in remembrance before the throne of God.

He exhorts his son "not to study revenge." But how far he, or at least they about him intend to follow that exhortation, was seen lately at the Hague, and by what attempts were likewise made in other places. How implacable they would be, it will be wisdom and our safety to believe rather, and prevent, than to make trial. And it will concern the multitude, though courted here, to take heed how they seek to hide or colour their own fickleness and instability with a bad repentance of their well-doing, and their fidelity to the better cause; to which at first so chearfully and conscientiously they joined themselves.

He returns again to extol the Church of England, and again requires his son by the joint authority of "a Father and a King, not to let his heart receive the least check or disaffection against it." And not without cause, for by that means having sole influence upon the clergy, and they upon the people, "after long search and many disputes," he could not possibly find a more compendious and politic way to uphold and settle tyranny, than by subduing first the consciences of vulgar men with the insensible poison of their slavish doctrine: for then the body and besotted mind without much reluctance was likeliest to admit the yoke.

He commends also "parliaments held with freedom and with honour." But I would ask how that can be, while he only must be the sole free person in that number; and would have the power with his unaccountable denial to dishonour them by rejecting all their counsels, to confine their law-giving power, which is the foundation of our freedom, and to change at his pleasure the very name of a parliament into the name of a faction?

The conclusion therefore must needs be quite contrary to what he concludes; that nothing can be more unhappy, more dishonourable, more unsafe for all, than when a wise, grave, and honourable parliament shall have laboured, debated, argued, consulted, and, as he himself speaks, "contributed" for the public good all their counsels in common, to be then frustrated, disappointed, denied and repulsed by the single whiff of a negative, from the mouth of one wilful man; nay, to be blasted, to be struck as mute and motionless as a parliament of tapestry in the hangings; or else after all their pains and travel to be dissolved, and cast away like so many noughts in arithmetic, unless it be to turn the O of their insignificance into a lamentation with the people, who had so vainly sent them. For this is not "to enact all things by public consent," as he would have us be persuaded, this is to enact nothing but by the private consent and leave of one not negative tyrant; this is mischief without remedy, a stifling and obstructing evil that hath no vent, no out-let, no passage through: grant him this, and the parliament hath no more freedom than if it sat in his noose, which when he pleases to draw together with one twitch of his negative, shall throttle a whole nation, to the wish of Caligula in one neck. This with the power of militia in his own hands over our bodies and estates, and the prelates to enthrall our consciences either by fraud or force, is the sum of that happiness and liberty we were to look for, whether in his own restitution, or in these precepts given to his son. Which unavoidably would have set us in the same state of misery, wherein we were before; and have either compelled us to submit like bond-slaves, or put us back to a second wandering over that horrid wilderness of distraction and civil slaughter, which, not without the strong and miraculous hand of God assisting us, we have measured out, and survived. And who knows, if we make so slight of this incomparable deliverance, which God hath bestowed upon us, but that we shall, like those foolish Israelites, who deposed God and Samuel to set up a king, "cry out" one day, "because of our king," which we have been mad upon; and then God, as he foretold them, will no more deliver us.

There remains now but little more of his discourse, whereof yet to take a short view will not be amiss. His words make semblance as if he were magnanimously exercising himself, and so teaching his son, "To want as well as to wear a crown;" and would seem to account it

“not worth taking up or enjoying, upon sordid, dishonourable, and irreligious terms;” and yet to his very last did nothing more industriously than strive to take up and enjoy again his sequestered crown, upon the most sordid, disloyal, dishonourable, and irreligious terms, not of making peace only, but of joining and incorporating with the murderous Irish, formerly by himself declared against, for “wicked and detestable rebels, odious to God and all good men.” And who but those rebels now, are the chief strength and confidence of his son; while the presbyter Scot that woos and solicits him, is neglected and put off, as if no terms were to him sordid, irreligious and dishonourable, but the Scottish and presbyterian.

He bids his son “keep to the true principles of piety, virtue, and honour, and he shall never want a kingdom.” And I say, people of England, keep ye to those principles, and ye shall never want a king. Nay, after such a fair deliverance as this, with so much fortitude and valour shewn against a tyrant, that people that should seek a king, claiming what this man claims, would shew themselves to be by nature slaves, and arrant beasts; not fit for that liberty which they cried out and bellowed for, but fitter to be led back again into their old bondage, like a sort of clamouring and fighting brutes, broke loose, that know not how to use or possess the liberty which they fought for.

The last sentence, whereon he seems to venture the whole weight of his former reasons and argumentations, “That religion to their God, and loyalty to their king, cannot be parted, without the sin and infelicity of a people,” is contrary to the plain teaching of Christ, that “No man can serve two masters;” but, if he hold to the one, he must reject and forsake the other. If God then, and earthly kings be for the most part not several only, but opposite masters, it will as oft happen, that they who will serve their king must forsake their God; and they who will serve God, must forsake their king; which then will neither be their sin, nor their infelicity; but their wisdom, their piety, and their true happiness: as to be deluded by these unsound and subtle ostentations here, would be their misery.

XXVIII. Intituled Meditations upon Death.

IT might be well thought by him who reads no further than the title of this last essay, that it required no answer. For all other human things are disputed, and will be variously thought of to the world's end. But this business of death is a plain case, and admits no controversy: in that centre all opinions meet. Nevertheless, since out of those few mortifying hours that should have been intirest to themselves, and most at peace from all passion and disquiet, he can afford spare time to inveigh bitterly against that justice which was done upon him; it will be needful to say something in defence of those proceedings, though briefly, in regard so much on this subject hath been written lately.

It happened once, as we find in Esdras and Josephus, authors not less believed than any under sacred, to be a great and solemn debate in the court of Darius, what thing was to be counted strongest of all other. He that could resolve this, in reward of his excellent wisdom, should be clad in purple, drink in gold, sleep in a bed of gold, and sit next to Darius. None but they who doubtless were reputed wise, had the question propounded to them: who after some respite given them by the king to consider, in full assembly of all his lords and gravest counsellors, returned severally what they thought. The first held, that wine was strongest, another that the king was strongest. But Zorobabel prince of the captive Jews, and heir to the crown of Judah, being one of them, proved women to be stronger than the king for that he himself had seen a concubine take his crown from off his head to set it upon her own: and others besides him have lately seen the like feat done, and not in jest. Yet he proved on, and it was so yielded by the king himself, and all his sages, that neither wine, nor women, nor the king, but truth, of all other things was the strongest. For me,

me, though neither asked, nor in a nation that gives such rewards to wisdom, I shall pronounce my sentence somewhat different from Zorobabel; and shall defend, that either truth and justice are all one, (for truth is but justice in our knowledge, and justice is but truth in our practice; and indeed he so explains himself, in saying that with truth is no accepting of persons, which is the property of justice:) or else if there be any odds, that justice, though not stronger than truth, yet by her office is to put forth and exhibit more strength in the affairs of mankind. For truth is properly no more than contemplation; and her utmost efficiency is but teaching: but justice in her very essence is all strength and activity; and hath a sword put into her hand, to use against all violence and oppression on the earth. She it is most truly, who accepts no person, and exempts none from the severity of her stroke. She never suffers injury to prevail, but when falsehood first prevails over truth; and that also is a kind of justice done on them who are so deluded. Though wicked kings and tyrants counterfeit her sword, as some did that buckler, fabled to fall from heaven into the capitol, yet she communicates her power to none but such as like herself are just, or at least will do justice. For it were extreme partiality and injustice, the flat denial and overthrow of herself, to put her own authentic sword into the hand of an unjust and wicked man, or so far to accept and exalt one mortal person above his equals, that he alone shall have the punishing of all other men transgressing, and not receive like punishment from men, when he himself shall be found the highest transgressor.

We may conclude therefore, that justice, above all other things, is and ought to be the strongest: she is the strength, the kingdom, the power, and majesty of all ages. Truth herself would subscribe to this, though Darius and all the monarchs of the world should deny. And if by sentence thus written, it were my happiness to set free the minds of Englishmen from longing to return poorly under that captivity of kings, from which the strength and supreme sword of justice hath delivered them, I shall have done a work not much inferior to that of Zorobabel: who by well praising and extolling the force of truth, in that contemplative strength conquered Darius; and freed his country and the people of God from the captivity of Babylon. Which I shall yet not despair to do, if they in this land whose minds are yet captive, be but as ingenuous to acknowledge the strength and supremacy of justice, as that heathen king was to confess the strength of truth: or let them but, as he did, grant that, and they will soon perceive that truth resigns all her outward strength to justice: justice therefore must needs be strongest, both in her own and in the strength of truth. But if a king may do among men whatsoever is his will and pleasure, and notwithstanding be unaccountable to men, then contrary to this magnified wisdom of Zorobabel, neither truth nor justice, but the king is strongest of all other things: which that Persian monarch himself in the midst of all his pride and glory durst not assume.

Let us see therefore what this king hath to affirm, why the sentence of justice and the weight of that sword which she delivers into the hands of men, should be more partial to him offending, than to all others of human race. First he pleads that "no law of God or man gives to subjects any power of judicature without or against him." Which assertion shall be proved in every part to be most untrue. The first express law of God given to mankind, was that to Noah, as a law, in general, to all the sons of men. And by that most ancient and universal law, "Whosoever sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed;" we find here no exception. If a king therefore do this; to a king, and that by men also, the same shall be done. This in the law of Moses, which came next, several times is repeated, and in one place remarkably, Numb. xxxv. "Ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer, but he shall surely be put to death: the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein," but by the blood of him that shed it. This is so spoken as that which concerned all Israel, not one man alone, to see performed; and if no satisfaction were to be taken, then certainly no exception. Nay the

king, when they should set up any, was to observe the whole law, and not only to see it done, but to "do it; that his heart might not be lifted up above his brethren," to dream of vain and reasonless prerogatives or exemptions, whereby the law itself must needs be founded in unrighteousness.

And were that true, which is most false, that all kings are the Lord's anointed, it were yet absurd to think that the anointment of God should be, as it were, a charm against law, and give them privilege, who punish others, to sin themselves unpunishably. The high-priest was the Lord's anointed as well as any king, and with the same consecrated oil: yet Solomon had put to death Abiathar, had it not been for other respects than that anointment. If God himself say to kings, "Touch not mine anointed," meaning his chosen people, as is evident in that psalm, yet no man will argue thence, that he protects them from civil laws if they offend; then certainly, though David as a private man, and in his own cause, feared to lift his hand against the Lord's anointed, much less can this forbid the law, or disarm justice from having legal power against any king. No other supreme magistrate, in what kind of government soever, lays claim to any such enormous privilege; wherefore then should any king, who is but one kind of magistrate, and set over the people for no other end than they?

Next in order of time to the laws of Moses, are those of Christ, who declares professedly his judicature to be spiritual, abstract from civil managements, and therefore leaves all nations to their own particular laws, and way of government. Yet because the church hath a kind of jurisdiction within her own bounds, and that also, though in process of time much corrupted and plainly turned into a corporal judicature, yet much approved by this king; it will be firm enough and valid against him, if subjects, by the laws of church also, be "invested with a power of judicature" both without and against their king, though pretending, and by them acknowledged "next and immediately under Christ supreme head and governor." Theodosius the emperor having made a slaughter of the Theffalonians for sedition, but too cruelly, was excommunicated to his face by St. Ambrose, who was his subject; and excommunication is the utmost of ecclesiastical judicature, a spiritual putting to death. But this, ye will say, was only an example. Read then the story, and it will appear, both that Ambrose avouched it for the law of God, and Theodosius confest it of his own accord to be so; "and that the law of God was not to be made void in him, for any reverence to his imperial power." From hence, not to be tedious, I shall pass into our own land of Britain; and show that subjects here have exercised the utmost of spiritual judicature, and more than spiritual against their kings, his predecessors. Vortiger, for committing incest with his daughter, was by St. German, at that time his subject, cursed and condemned in a British council about the year 448; and thereupon soon after was deposed. Mauricus, a king in Wales, for breach of oath, and the murder of Cynetus, was excommunicated and curst, with all his offspring, by Oudoceus bishop of Llandaff in full synod, about the year 560; and not restored till he had repented. Morcant, another king in Wales, having slain Frioc his uncle, was fain to come in person, and receive judgment from the same bishop and his clergy; who upon his penitence acquitted him, for no other cause than lest the kingdom should be destitute of a successor in the royal line. These examples are of the primitive, British, and episcopal church; long ere they had any commerce or communion with the church of Rome. What power afterward of deposing kings, and so consequently of putting them to death, was assumed and practised by the canon law, I omit, as a thing generally known. Certainly, if whole councils of the Romish church have in the midst of their dimness discerned so much of truth, as to decree at Constance, and at Basil, and many of them to avouch at Trent also, that a council is above the pope, and may judge him, though by them not denied to be the vicar of Christ, we in our clearer light may be ashamed not to discern further, that a parliament is by all equity and right above a king,
and

and may judge him, whose reasons and pretensions to hold of God only, as his immediate vicegerent, we know how far fetched they are, and insufficient.

As for the laws of man, it would ask a volume to repeat all that might be cited in this point against him from all antiquity. In Greece, Orestes the Son of Agamemnon, and by succession king of Argos, was in that country judged and condemned to death for killing his mother: whence escaping, he was judged again, though a stranger, before the great council of Areopagus in Athens. And this memorable act of judicature, was the first that brought the justice of that grave senate into fame and high estimation over all Greece for many ages after. And in the same city, tyrants were to undergo legal sentence by the laws of Solon. The kings of Sparta, though descended lineally from Hercules, esteemed a God among them, were often judged, and sometimes put to death by the most just and renowned laws of Lycurgus; who, though a king, thought it most unequal to bind his subjects by any law, to which he bound not himself. In Rome the laws made by Valerius Publicola, and what the senate decreed against Nero, that he should be judged, and punished according to the laws of their ancestors, and what in like manner was decreed against other emperors, is vulgarly known. And that the civil law warrants like power of judicature to subjects against tyrants, is written clearly by the best and famous civilians. For if it was decreed by Theodosius, and stands yet firm in the code of Justinian, that the law is above the emperor, then certainly the emperor being under law, the law may judge him; and if judge him, may punish him, proving tyrannous: how else is the law above him, or to what purpose? These are necessary deductions; and thereafter hath been done in all ages and kingdoms, oftner than to be here recited.

But what need we any further search after the laws of other lands, for that which is so fully and so plainly set down lawful in our own? Where ancient books tell us, Bracton, Fleta, and others, that the king is under law, and inferior to his court of parliament; that although his place "to do justice" be highest, yet that he stands as liable "to receive justice," as the meanest of his kingdom. Nay, Alfred the most worthy king, and by some accounted first absolute monarch of the Saxons here, so ordained; as is cited out of an ancient law-book called "the Mirror;" in "Rights of the kingdom, p. 31." where it is complained on, "as the sovereign abuse of all," that "the king should be deemed above the law, whereas he ought to be subject to it by his oath." Of which oath, antiently it was the last clause, that the king "should be as liable, and obedient to suffer right, as others of his people." And indeed it were but fond and senseless, that the king should be accountable to every petty suit in lesser courts, as we all know he was, and not be subject to the judicature of parliament in the main matters of our common safety or destruction; that he should be answerable in the ordinary courts of law for any wrong done to a private person, and not answerable in court of parliament for destroying the whole kingdom. By all this, and much more that might be added, as in an argument over-copious rather than barren, we see it manifest that all laws both of God and man are made without exemption of any person whomsoever; and that if kings presume to over-top the law by which they reign for the public good, they are by law to be reduced into order; and that can no way be more justly, than by those who exalted them to that high place. For who should better understand their own laws, and when they are transgressed, than they who are governed by them, and whose consent first made them? And who can have more right to take knowledge of things done within a free nation, than they within themselves?

Those objected oaths of allegiance and supremacy we swore, not to his person, but as it was invested with his authority; and his authority was by the people first given him conditionally, in law, and under law, and under oath also for the kingdom's good, and not otherwise; the oaths then were interchanged, and mutual; stood and fell together; he swore fidelity to his trust; not as a deluding ceremony, but as a real condition of their

their admitting him for king; and the conqueror himself swore it oftner than at his crowning: they swore homage and fealty to his person in that trust. There was no reason why the kingdom should be further bound by oaths to him, than he by his coronation oath to us, which he hath every way broken: and having broken, the ancient crown-oath of Alfred above-mentioned, conceals not his penalty.

As for the covenant, if that be meant, certainly no discreet person can imagine it should bind us to him in any stricter sense than those oaths formerly. The acts of hostility which we received from him, were no such dear obligations that we should owe him more fealty and defence for being our enemy, than we could before when we took him only for a king. They were accused by him and his party to pretend liberty and reformation, but to have no other end than to make themselves great, and to destroy the king's person and authority. For which reason they added that third article, testifying to the world, that as they were resolved to endeavour first a reformation in the church, to extirpate prelacy, to preserve the rights of parliament, and the liberties of the kingdom, so they intended, so far as it might consist with the preservation and defence of these, to preserve the king's person and authority; but not otherwise. As far as this comes to, they covenant and swear in the sixth article, to preserve and defend the persons and authority of one another, and all those that enter into that league; so that this covenant gives no unlimitable exemption to the king's person, but gives to all as much defence and preservation as to him, and to him as much as to their own persons, and no more; that is to say, in order and subordination to those main ends for which we live and are a nation of men joined in society either christian, or at least human. But if the covenant were made absolute, to preserve and defend any one whomsoever, without respect had, either to the true religion, or those other superior things to be defended and preserved however, it cannot then be doubted, but that the covenant was rather a most foolish, hasty, and unlawful vow, than a deliberate and well-weighed covenant; swearing us into labyrinths and repugnances, no way to be solved or reconciled, and therefore no way to be kept; as first offending against the law of God, to vow the absolute preservation, defence, and maintaining of one man, though in his sins and offences never so great and heinous against God or his neighbour; and to except a person from justice, whereas his law excepts none. Secondly, it offends against the law of this nation, wherein, as hath been proved, kings in receiving justice, and undergoing due trial, are not differenced from the meanest subject. Lastly, it contradicts and offends against the covenant itself, which vows in the fourth article to bring to open trial and condign punishment all those that shall be found guilty of such crimes and delinquencies, whereof the king by his own letters and other undeniable testimonies not brought to light till afterward, was found and convicted to be the chief actor in what they thought him, at the time of taking that covenant, to be over-ruled only by evil counsellors; and those, or whomsoever they should discover to be principal, they vowed to try, "either by their own supreme judicatories," (for so even then they called them,) "or by others having power from them to that effect." So that to have brought the king to condign punishment hath not broke the covenant, but it would have broke the covenant to have saved him from those judicatories, which both nations declared in that covenant to be supreme against any person whatsoever. And if the covenant swore otherwise to preserve him than in the preservation of true religion and our liberties, against which he fought, if not in arms, yet in resolution to his dying day, and now after death still fights against in this his book, the covenant was better broken, than he saved. And God hath testified by all propitious and evident signs, whereby in these latter times he is wont to testify what pleases him, that such a solemn and for many ages unexampled act of due punishment, was no mockery of justice, but a most grateful and well-pleasing sacrifice. Neither was it to cover their Perjury, as he accuses, but to uncover his perjury to the oath of his coronation.

The

The rest of his discourse quite forgets the title; and turns his meditations upon death into obloquy and bitter vehemence against his "Judges and Accusers;" imitating therein, not our Saviour, but his grandmother Mary queen of Scots, as also in the most of his other scruples, exceptions and evasions; and from whom he seems to have learnt, as it were by heart, or else by kind, that which is thought by his admirers to be most virtuous, most manly, most christian, and most martyr-like, both of his words and speeches here, and of his answers and behaviour at his trial.

"It is a sad fate," he saith, "to have his enemies both accusers, parties, and judges." Sad indeed, but no sufficient plea to acquit him from being so judged. For what malefactor might not sometimes plead the like? If his own crimes have made all men his enemies, who else can judge him? They of the powder-plot against his father, might as well have pleaded the same. Nay, at the resurrection it may as well be pleaded, that the saints who then shall judge the world, are "both enemies, judges, parties, and accusers."

So much he thinks to abound in his own defence, that he undertakes an unmeasurable task to bespeak "the singular care and protection of God over all kings," as being the greatest patrons of law, justice, order, and religion on earth. But what patrons they be, God in the scripture oft enough hath exprest; and the earth itself hath too long groaned under the burden of their injustice, disorder, and irreligion. Therefore "to bind their kings in chains, and their nobles with links of Iron," is an honour belonging to his saints; not to build Babel, which was Nimrod's work, the first king, and the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, but to destroy it, especially that spiritual Babel: and first to overcome those European kings, which receive their power, not from God, but from the beast; and are counted no better than his ten horns. "These shall hate the great whore," and yet "shall give their kingdoms to the beast that carries her; they shall commit fornication with her," and yet "shall burn her with fire," and yet "shall lament the fall of Babylon," where they fornicated with her.

Thus shall they be to and fro, doubtful and ambiguous in all their doings, until at last, "joining their armies with the beast," whose power first raised them, they shall perish with him by the "King of Kings," against whom they have rebelled; and "the fowls shall eat their flesh." This is their doom written, and the utmost that we find concerning them in these latter days; which we have much more cause to believe, than his unwarranted revelation here, prophesying what shall follow after his death, with the spirit of enmity, not of St. John.

He would fain bring us out of conceit with the good Success which God hath vouchsafed us. We measure not our cause by our success, but our success by our cause. Yet certainly in a good cause, success is a good confirmation; for God hath promised it to good men almost in every leaf of scripture. If it argue not for us, we are sure it argues not against us; but as much or more for us, than ill success argues for them; for to the wicked God hath denounced ill success in all that they take in hand.

He hopes much of those "softer tempers," as he calls them, and "less advantaged by his ruin, that their consciences do already" gripe them. 'Tis true, there be a sort of moody, hot-brained, and always unedified consciences; apt to engage their leaders into great and dangerous affairs past retirement, and then upon a sudden qualm and swimming of their conscience, to betray them basely in the midst of what was chiefly undertaken for their sakes. Let such men never meet with any faithful parliament to hazard for them; never with any noble spirit to conduct and lead them out, but let them live and die in servile condition and their scrupulous queasiness, if no instruction will confirm them. Others there be in whose consciences the loss of gain, and those advantages they hoped for, hath sprung a sudden leak. These are they that cry out, the Covenant broken! and to keep it better, slide back into neutrality, or join actually with incendiaries and malignants. But God hath eminently begun to punish those, first, in Scotland; then

then in Ulster, who have provoked him with the most hateful kind of mockery, to break his covenant under pretence of strictest keeping it; and hath subjected them to those malignants, with whom they scrupled not to be associates. In God therefore we shall not fear what their false fraternity can do against us.

He seeks again with cunning words to turn our success into our sin. But might call to mind that the scripture speaks of those also, who "when God slew them, then sought him;" yet did but "flatter him with their mouth, and lyed to him with their tongues; for their heart was not right with him." And there was one who in the time of his affliction trespassed more against God: "This was that king Ahaz."

He glories much in the forgiveness of his enemies; so did his grandmother at her death. Wise men would sooner have believed him, had he not so often told us so. But he hopes to erect "the trophies of his charity over us." And trophies of charity no doubt will be as glorious as trumpets before the alms of hypocrites; and more especially the trophies of such an aspiring charity as offers in his prayer to share victory with God's compassion, which is over all his works. Such prayers as these may perhaps catch the people, as was intended: but how they please God, is to be much doubted, though prayed in secret, much less written to be divulged. Which perhaps may gain him after death a short, contemptible, and soon fading reward; not what he aims at, to stir the constancy and solid firmness of any wise man, or to unsettle the conscience of any knowing christian, if he could ever aim at a thing so hopeless, and above the genius of his Cleric elocution, but to catch the worthless approbation of an inconstant, irrational, and image-doting rabble. The rest, whom perhaps ignorance without malice, or some error, less than fatal, hath for the time misled, on this side sorcery or obduration, may find the grace and good guidance to bethink themselves and recover.

A
D E F E N C E
O F T H E
P E O P L E o f E N G L A N D,

In A N S W E R to
S A L M A S I U S ' S D E F E N C E o f t h e K I N G *.

The P R E F A C E.

ALTHOUGH I fear, lest, if in defending the people of England, I should be as copious in words, and empty of matter, as most men think Salmasius has been in his defence of the king, I might seem to deserve justly to be accounted a verbose and silly defender; yet since no man thinks himself obliged to make so much haste, though in the handling but of any ordinary subject, as not to premise some introduction at least, according as the weight of the subject requires; if I take the same course in handling almost the greatest subject that ever was (without being too tedious in it) I am in hopes of attaining two things, which indeed I earnestly desire: the one, not to be at all wanting, as far as in me lies, to this most noble cause, and most worthy to be recorded to all future ages: the other, that I may appear to have avoided myself, that frivolousness of matter, and redundancy of words, which I blame in my antagonist. For I am about to discourse of matters, neither inconsiderable nor common, but how a most potent king, after he had trampled upon the laws of the nation, and given a shock to its religion, and begun to rule at his own will and pleasure, was at last subdued in the field by his own subjects, who had undergone a long slavery under him; how afterwards he was cast into prison, and when he gave no ground, either by words or actions, to hope better things of him, he was finally by the supreme council of the kingdom condemned to die, and beheaded before the very gates of the royal palace. I shall likewise relate (which will much conduce to the easing men's minds of a great superstition) by what right, especially according to our law, this judgment was given, and all these matters transacted; and shall easily defend my valiant and worthy countrymen (who have extremely well deserved of all subjects and nations in the world) from the most wicked calumnies both of domestic and foreign railers, and especially from the reproaches of this most vain and empty sophister, who sets up for a captain and ringleader to all the rest. For what king's majesty sitting upon an exalted throne, ever shone so brightly, as that of the

* This translation of the author's "Defensio pro populo Anglicano," Mr. Toland ascribes to Mr. Washington, a gentleman of the Temple.

people of England then did, when shaking off that old superstition, which had prevailed a long time, they gave judgment upon the king himself, or rather upon an enemy who had been their king, caught as it were in a net by his own laws, (who alone of all mortals challenged to himself impunity by a divine right) and scrupled not to inflict the same punishment upon him, being guilty, which he would have inflicted upon any other? But why do I mention these things as performed by the people, which almost open their voice themselves, and testify the presence of God throughout? who, as often as it seems good to his infinite wisdom, uses to throw down proud and unruly kings, exalting themselves above the condition of human nature, and utterly to extirpate them and all their family. By his manifest impulse being set on work to recover our almost lost liberty, following him as our guide, and adoring the impresses of his divine power manifested upon all occasions, we went on in no obscure, but an illustrious passage, pointed out and made plain to us by God himself. Which things, if I should so much as hope by any diligence or ability of mine, such as it is, to discourse of as I ought to do, and to commit them so to writing, as that perhaps all nations and all ages may read them, it would be a very vain thing in me. For what stile can be august and magnificent enough, what man has parts sufficient to undertake so great a task? Since we find by experience, that in so many ages as are gone over the world, there has been but here and there a man found; who has been able worthily to recount the actions of great heroes, and potent states; can any man have so good an opinion of his own talents, as to think himself capable to reach these glorious and wonderful works of Almighty God, by any language, by any stile of his? Which enterprize, though some of the most eminent persons in our commonwealth have prevailed upon me by their authority to undertake, and would have it be my business to vindicate with my pen against envy and calumny (which are proof against arms) those glorious performances of theirs (whose opinion of me I take as a very great honour that they should pitch upon me before others to be serviceable in this kind to those most valiant deliverers of my native country; and true it is, that from my very youth, I have been bent extremely upon such sort of studies, as inclined me, if not to do great things myself, at least to celebrate those that did) yet as having no confidence in any such advantages, I have recourse to the divine assistance; and invoke the great and holy God, the giver of all good gifts, that I may as substantially, and as truly, discourse and refute the sauciness and lyes of this foreign declamator, as our noble generals piously and successfully by force of arms broke the king's pride, and his unruly domineering, and afterwards put an end to both by inflicting a memorable punishment upon himself, and as thoroughly as a single person did with ease but of late confute and confound the king himself, rising as it were from the grave, and recommending himself to the people in a book published after his death, with new artifices and allurements of words and expressions. Which antagonist of mine, though he be a foreigner, and, though he deny it a thousand times over, but a poor grammarian; yet not contented with the salary due to him in that capacity, chose to turn a pragmatical coxcomb; and not only to intrude in state-affairs, but into the affairs of a foreign state: tho' he brings along with him neither modesty, nor understanding, nor any other qualification requisite in so great an arbitrator, but sauciness, and a little grammar only. Indeed if he had published here, and in English, the same things as he has now wrote in Latin, such as it is, I think no man would have thought it worth while to return an answer to them, but would partly despise them as common, and exploded over and over already, and partly abhor them as sordid and tyrannical maxims, not to be endured even by the most abject of slaves: nay, men that have sided with the king, would have had these thoughts of his book. But since he has swoln it to a considerable bulk, and dispersed it amongst foreigners, who are altogether ignorant of our affairs and constitution; it is fit that they who mistake them, should be better informed; and that he, who is so very forward to speak ill of others, should be treated in his own kind. If it be asked, why we did not then attack him sooner, why we suffered him to triumph so long, and pride himself in our silence?

silence? For others I am not to answer; for myself I can boldly say, That I had neither words nor arguments long to seek for the defence of so good a cause, if I had enjoyed such a measure of health, as would have endured the fatigue of writing. And being but weak in body, I am forced to write by piece-meal, and break off almost every hour, though the subject be such as requires an unintermitted study and intenseness of mind. But though this bodily indisposition may be a hindrance to me in setting forth the just praises of my most worthy countrymen, who have been the saviours of their native country, and whose exploits, worthy of immortality, are already famous all the world over; yet I hope it will be no difficult matter for me to defend them from the insolence of this silly little scholar, and from that saucy tongue of his, at least. Nature and laws would be in an ill case, if slavery should find what to say for itself, and liberty be mute: and if tyrants should find men to plead for them, and they that can master and vanquish tyrants, should not be able to find advocates. And it were a deplorable thing indeed, if the reason mankind is endued withal, and which is the gift of God, should not furnish more arguments for men's preservation, for their deliverance, and, as much as the nature of the thing will bear, for making them equal to one another, than for their oppression, and for their utter ruin under the domineering power of one single person. Let me therefore enter upon this noble cause with a cheerfulness, grounded upon this assurance, That my adversary's cause is maintained by nothing but fraud, fallacy, ignorance and barbarity; whereas mine has light, truth, reason, the practice and the learning of the best ages of the world, of its side.

But now, having said enough for an introduction, since we have to do with critics; let us in the first place consider the title of this choice piece: "Defensio Regia pro Car. Primo, ad Car. Secundum: A Royal Defence (or the king's defence) for Charles the First, to Charles the Second." You undertake a wonderful piece of work, whoever you are; to plead the father's cause before his own son: a hundred to one but you carry it. But I summon you, Salmasius, who heretofore sculked under a wrong name, and now go by no name at all, to appear before another tribunal, and before other judges, where perhaps you may not hear those little applauses, which you use to be so fond of in your school. But why this royal defence dedicated to the king's own son? We need not put him to the torture; he confesses why. "At the king's charge," says he. O mercenary and chargeable advocate! could you not afford to write a defence for Charles the father, whom you pretend to have been the best of kings, to Charles the son, the most indigent of all kings, but it must be at the poor king's own charge? But though you are a knave, you would not make yourself ridiculous, in calling it the king's defence; for you having sold it, it is no longer yours, but the king's indeed: who bought it at the price of a hundred Jacobusses, a great sum for a poor king to disburse. I know very well what I say: and it is well enough known who brought the gold, and the purse wrought with beads: We know who saw you reach out greedy fists, under pretence of embracing the king's chaplain, who brought the present, but indeed to embrace the present itself, and by accepting it to exhaust almost all the king's treasury.

But now the man comes himself, the door creaks; the actor comes upon the stage.

In silence now, and with attention wait,

That ye may learn what th' Eunuch has to prate.

Terent.

For whatever the matter is with him, he blusters more than ordinary. "A horrible message had lately struck our ears, but our minds more, with a heinous wound concerning a parricide committed in England in the person of a king, by a wicked conspiracy of sacrilegious men." Indeed that horrible message must either have had a much longer sword than that which Peter drew, or those ears must have been of a wonderful length, that it could wound at such a distance; for it could not so much as in the least

offend any ears but those of an ass. For what harm is it to you, that are foreigners? Are any of you hurt by it, if we amongst ourselves put our own enemies, our own traitors to death, be they commoners, noblemen, or kings? Do you, Salmasius, let alone what does not concern you: for I have a horrible message to bring of you too; which I am mistaken if it strike not a more heinous wound into the ears of all grammarians and critics, provided they have any learning and delicacy in them, to wit, your crouding so many barbarous expressions together in one period in the person of (Aristarchus) a grammarian; and that so great a critic as you, hired at the king's charge to write a defence of the king his father, should not only set so fulsome a preface before it, much like those lamentable ditties that used to be sung at funerals, and which can move compassion in none but a coxcomb; but in the very first sentence should provoke your readers to laughter with so many barbarisms all at once. "Persona Regis," you cry. Where do you find any such Latin? Or are you telling us some tale or other of a Perkin Warbec, who taking upon him the person of a king, has, forsooth, committed some horrible parricide in England? Which expression, though dropping carelessly from your pen, has more truth in it than you are aware of. For a tyrant is but like a king upon a stage, a man in a vizor, and acting the part of a king in a play; he is not really a king. But as for these Gallicisms, that are so frequent in your book, I won't lash you for them myself, for I am not at leisure; but shall deliver you over to your fellow-grammarians, to be laugh't to scorn and whipt by them. What follows is much more heinous, that what was decreed by our supreme magistrates to be done to the king, should be said by you to have been done "by a wicked conspiracy of sacrilegious persons." Have you the impudence, you rogue, to talk at this rate of the acts and decrees of the chief magistrates of a nation, that lately was a most potent kingdom, and is now a more potent commonwealth? Whose proceedings no king ever took upon him by word of mouth, or otherwise to vilify and set at nought. The illustrious states of Holland therefore, the genuine off-spring of those deliverers of their country, have deservedly by their edict condemned to utter darkness this Defence of tyrants, so pernicious to the liberty of all nations; the author of which, every free state ought to forbid their country, or to banish out of it; and that state particularly that feeds with a stipend so ungrateful and so savage an enemy to their commonwealth, whose very fundamentals, and the causes of their becoming a free state, this fellow endeavours to undermine as well as ours, and at one and the same time to subvert both; loading with calumnies the most worthy assertors of liberty there, under our names. Consider with yourselves, ye most illustrious states of the United Netherlands, who it was that put this assertor of kingly power upon setting pen to paper? who it was, that but lately began to play Rex in your country? what counsels were taken, what endeavours used, and what disturbances ensued thereupon in Holland? and to what pass things might have been brought by this time? How slavery and a new master were ready prepared for you; and how near expiring that liberty of yours, asserted and vindicated by so many years war and toil, would have been ere now, if it had not taken breath again by the timely death of a certain rash young Gentleman. But our author begins to strut again, and to feign wonderful tragedies; "Whomsoever this dreadful news reached (to wit, the news of Salmasius's parricidal barbarisms) all of a sudden, as if they had been struck with lightning, their hair stood an end, and their tongues clove to the roof of their mouth." Which let natural philosophers take notice of (for this secret in nature was never discovered before) that lightning makes mens hair stand on end. But who knows not that little effeminate minds are apt to be amazed at the news of any extraordinary great action; and that then they shew themselves to be, what they really were before, no better than so many stocks? "Some could not refrain from tears;" some little women at court, I suppose, or if there be any more effeminate than they, of whose number Salmasius himself being one, is by a new Metamorphosis become a fountain near a kin to his name (Salmacis) and with his counter-

counterfeit flood of tears prepared over night, endeavours to emasculate generous minds :
I advise therefore, and wish them to have a care ;

—Infamis ne quem malè fortibus undis
Salmacis enervet.—

—Ne, si vir cum venerit, exeat indè
Semivir, & tactis subitò mollescat in undis.

Abstain, as manhood you esteem,
From Salmacis' pernicious stream :
If but one moment there you stay,
Too dear you'll for your bathing pay.—
Depart nor man nor woman, but a sight
Disgracing both, a loath'd hermaphrodite.

“ They that had more courage” (which yet he expresses in miserable bald Latin, as if he could not so much as speak of men of courage and magnanimity in proper words) “ were set on fire with indignation to that degree, that they could hardly contain themselves.” Those furious Hectors we value not of a rush. We have been accustomed to rout such bullies in the field with a true sober courage ; a courage becoming men that can contain themselves, and are in their right wits. “ There were none that did not curse the authors of so horrible a villany.” But yet, you say, their tongues clove to the roof of their mouths ; and if you mean this of our fugitives only, I wish they had clove there to this day ; for we know very well that there is nothing more common with them, than to have their mouths full of curses and imprecations, which indeed all good men abominate, but withal despise. As for others, it is hardly credible, that when they heard the news of our having inflicted a capital punishment upon the king, there should any be found, especially in a free state, so naturally adapted to slavery as either to speak ill of us, or so much as to censure what we had done. Nay, it is highly probable that all good men applauded us, and gave God thanks for so illustrious, so exalted a piece of justice ; and for a caution so very useful to other princes. In the mean time, as for those fierce, those steel-hearted men, that, you say, take on for, and bewail so pitifully, the lamentable and wonderful death of I know not who ; them I say, together with their tinkling advocate, the dullest that ever appeared since the name of a king was born and known in the world, we shall even let whine on, till they cry their eyes out. But in the mean time, what school-boy, what little insignificant monk could not have made a more elegant speech for the king, and in better Latin than this royal advocate has done ? But it would be folly in me to make such particular animadversions upon his childishness and frenzies throughout his book, as I do here upon a few in the beginning of it ; which yet I would be willing enough to do (for we hear that he is swelled with pride and conceit to the utmost degree imaginable) if the undigested and immethodical bulk of his book did not protect him. He was resolved to take a course like the soldier in Terence, to save his bacon ; and it was very cunning in him to stuff his book with so much puerility, and so many silly whimsies, that it might nauseate the smartest man in the world to death to take notice of them all. Only I thought it might not be amiss to give a specimen of him in the preface ; and to let the serious reader have a taste of him at first, that he might guess by the first dish that is served up, how noble an entertainment the rest are like to make ; and that he may imagine with himself what an infinite number of fooleries and impertinencies must needs be heaped up together in the body of the book, when they stand so thick in the very entrance into it, where, of all other places, they ought to have been shunned. His tittle-tattle that follows, and his sermons fit for nothing but to be worm-eaten, I can easily pass by ; as for any thing in them relating to us, we doubt not in the least, but that what

has been written and published by authority of parliament, will have far greater weight with all wise and sober men, than the calumnies and lies of one single impudent little fellow : who being hired by our fugitives, their country's enemies, has scraped together, and not scrupled to publish in print, whatever little story any one of them that employed him, put into his head. And that all men may plainly see how little conscience he makes of setting down any thing right or wrong, good or bad, I desire no other witness than Salmasius himself. In his book, entitled, "*Apparatus contra Primatum Papæ*," he says, 'There are most weighty reasons why the Church ought to lay aside episcopacy, and return to the apostolical institution of presbyters : That a far greater mischief has been introduced into the Church by episcopacy, than the schisms themselves were, which were before apprehended : That the plague which episcopacy introduced, depressed the whole body of the Church under a miserable tyranny ; nay, had put a yoke even upon the necks of kings and princes : That it would be more beneficial to the Church, if the whole hierarchy itself were extirpated, than if the pope only, who is the head of it, were laid aside," page 160. 'That it would be very much for the good of the Church, if episcopacy were taken away, together with the papacy : That if episcopacy were once taken down, the papacy would fall of itself, as being founded upon it,' page 171. He says, 'he can shew very good reasons why episcopacy ought to be put down in those kingdoms that have renounced the pope's supremacy ; but that he can see no reason for retaining it there : That a reformation is not entire, that is defective in this point : That no reason can be alledged, no probable cause assigned, why the supremacy of the pope being once disowned, episcopacy should notwithstanding be retained,' page 197. Though he had wrote all this, and a great deal more to this effect, but four years ago, he is now become so vain and so impudent withal, as to accuse the parliament of England, 'for not only turning the bishops out of the house of lords, but for abolishing episcopacy itself.' Nay, he persuades us to receive episcopacy, and defends it by the very same reasons and arguments, which with a great deal of earnestness he had confuted himself in that former book ; to wit, 'that bishops were necessary, and ought to have been retained, to prevent the springing up of a thousand pernicious sects and heresies.' Crafty turn-coat ! Are you not ashamed to shift hands thus in things that are sacred, and (I had almost said) to betray the Church ; whose most solemn institutions you seem to have asserted and vindicated with so much noise, that when it should seem for your interest to change sides, you might undo and subvert all again with the more disgrace and infamy to yourself ? It is notoriously known, that when both houses of parliament, being extremely desirous to reform the church of England by the pattern of our reformed churches, had resolved to abolish episcopacy, the king first interposed and afterwards waged war against them chiefly for that very cause ; which proved fatal to him. Go now and boast of your having defended the king ; who, that you might the better defend him, do now openly betray and impugn the cause of the church, whose defence you yourself had formerly undertaken ; and whose severest censures ought to be inflicted upon you. As for the present form of our government, since such a foreign insignificant professor as you, having laid aside your boxes and desks stuffed with nothing but trifles, which you might have spent your time better in putting into order, will needs turn busy-body, and be troublesome in other men's matters, I shall return you this answer, or rather not to you, but to them that are wiser than yourself, viz. That the form of it is such as our present distractions will admit of ; not such as were to be wished, but such as the obstinate divisions that are amongst us, will bear. What state soever is pestered with factions, and defends itself by force of arms, is very just in having regard to those only that are sound and untainted, and in overlooking or secluding the rest, be they of the nobility or the common people ; nay, though profiting by experience, they should refuse to be governed any longer, either by a king or a house of lords. But in railing at that Supreme Council, as you call it, and at the Chairman there,

there, you make yourself very ridiculous; for that council is not the supreme council, as you dream it is, but appointed by authority of parliament, for a certain time only; and consisting of forty persons, for the most part members of parliament, any one of whom may be president, if the rest vote him into the chair. And there is nothing more common, than for our parliaments to appoint committees of their own members; who when so appointed, have power to meet where they please, and hold a kind of a little parliament amongst themselves. And the most weighty affairs are often referred to them, for expedition and secrecy; the care of the navy, the army, the treasury; in short, all things whatsoever relating either to war or peace. Whether this be called a council, or any thing else, the thing is ancient, though the name may be new; and it is such an institution, as no government can be duly administered without it. As for our putting the king to death, and changing the government, forbear your bawling, don't spit your venom, till, going along with you through every chapter, I show, whether you will or no, "by what law, by what right and justice" all that was done. But if you insist to know "by what right, by what law;" by that law, I tell you, which God and nature have enacted, viz. that whatever things are for the universal good of the whole state, are for that reason lawful and just. So wise men of old used to answer such as you. You find fault with us for "repealing laws that had obtained for so many years;" but you do not tell us whether those laws were good or bad, nor, if you did, should we heed what you said; for, you busy puppy, what have you to do with our laws? I wish our magistrates had repealed more than they have, both laws and lawyers; if they had, they would have consulted the interest of the christian religion, and that of the people better than they have done. It frets you, That "hobgoblins, sons of the earth, scarce gentlemen at home, scarce known to their own countrymen, should presume to do such things." But you ought to have remembered, what not only the scriptures, but Horace would have taught you, viz.

— Valet ima summis
Mutare, & insignem attenuat Deus,
Obscura promens, &c.

The power that did create, can change the scene
Of things; make mean of great, and great of mean:
The brightest glory can eclipse with night;
And place the most obscure in dazling light.

But take this into the bargain. Some of those who, you say, be scarce gentlemen, are not at all inferior in birth to any of your party. Others, whose ancestors were not noble, have taken a course to attain to true nobility by their own industry and virtue, and are not inferior to men of the noblest descent. They had rather be called "Sons of the Earth," provided it be their own earth (their own native country) and act like men at home, than, being destitute of house or land, to relieve the necessities of nature in a foreign country by selling of smoke, as thou dost, an inconsiderable fellow and a jack-straw, and who dependest upon the good-will of thy masters for a poor stipend; for whom it were better to dispense with thy labours, and return to thy own kindred and countrymen, if thou hadst not this one piece of cunning, to babble out some silly prelections and fooleries at so good a rate amongst foreigners. You find fault with our magistrates for admitting such "a common-shore of all sorts of sects." Why should they not? It belongs to the church to cast them out of the communion of the faithful; not to the magistrate to banish them the country, provided they do not offend against the civil laws of the state. Men at first united into civil societies, that they might live safely, and enjoy their liberty, without being wronged or oppressed; and that
they

they might live religiously and according to the doctrine of christianity, they united themselves into churches. Civil societies have laws, and churches have a discipline peculiar to themselves, and far differing from each other. And this has been the occasion of so many wars in Christendom; to wit, because the civil magistrate and the church confounded their jurisdictions. Therefore we do not admit of the Popish sect, so as to tolerate papists at all; for we do not look upon that as a religion, but rather as an hierarchical Tyranny, under a cloak of religion, cloathed with the spoils of the civil power, which it has usurped to itself, contrary to our Saviour's own doctrine. As for the Independents, we never had any such amongst us, as you describe; they that we call Independents, are only such as hold that no classis or synods have a superiority over any particular church, and that therefore they ought all to be plucked up by the roots, as branches, or rather as the very trunk of hierarchy itself; which is your own opinion too. And from hence it was that the name of Independents prevailed amongst the vulgar. The rest of your preface is spent in endeavouring not only to stir up the hatred of all kings and monarchs against us, but to persuade them to make a general war upon us. Mithridates of old, though in a different cause, endeavoured to stir up all princes to make war upon the Romans, by laying to their charge almost just the same things that you do to ours: viz. that the Romans aimed at nothing but the subversion of all kingdoms, that they had no regard to any thing, whether sacred or civil, that from their very first rise, they never enjoyed any thing but what they had acquired by force, that they were robbers, and the greatest enemies in the world to monarchy. Thus Mithridates expressed himself in a letter to Arsaces, king of the Parthians. But how came you, whose business it is to make silly speeches from your desk, to have the confidence to imagine, that by your persuasions to take up arms, and sounding an Alarm as it were, you should be able so much as to influence a king amongst boys at play; especially, with so shrill a voice, and unfavoury breath, that I believe, if you were to have been the trumpeter, not so much as Homer's mice would have waged war against the frogs? So little do we fear, you slug you, any war or danger from foreign princes through your silly rhetoric, who accusest us to them, just as if you were at play, "That we toss kings heads like balls; play at bowls with crowns; and regard scepters no more than if they were fool's staves with heads on:" But you in the mean time, you silly loggerhead, deserve to have your bones well thrashed with a fool's staff, for thinking to stir up kings and princes to war by such childish arguments. Then you cry aloud to all nations, who, I know full well, will never heed what you say. You call upon that wretched and barbarous crew of Irish rebels too, to assert the king's party. Which one thing is sufficient evidence how much you are both a fool and a knave, and how you out-do almost all mankind in villany, impudence and madness; who scruple not to implore the loyalty and aid of an execrable people, devoted to the slaughter, whom the king himself always abhorred, or so pretended, to have any thing to do with, by reason of the guilt of so much innocent blood, which they had contracted. And that very perfidiousness and cruelty, which he endeavoured as much as he could to conceal, and to clear himself from any suspicion of, you the most villanous of mortals, as fearing neither God nor man, voluntarily and openly take upon yourself. Go on then, undertake the king's defence at the encouragement, and by the assistance of the Irish. You take care, and so you might well, lest any should imagine that you were about to bereave Cicero or Demosthenes of the praise due to their eloquence, by telling us before-hand, that "you conceive you ought not to speak like an Orator." It is wisely said of a fool; you conceive you ought not to do what is not in your power to do: and who that knows you never so little, ever expects any thing like an Orator from you? Who neither uses, nor is able to publish any thing that is elaborate, distinct, or has so much as sense in it; but like a second Critpin, or that little Grecian Tzetzes, you do but write a great deal, take no pains to write well; nor could write any thing well, though you took never so much pains.

pains. "This cause shall be argued (say you) in the hearing, and as it were before the tribunal of all mankind." That is what we like so well, that we could now wish we had a discreet and intelligent adversary, and not such a hair-brained blunderbuss, as you, to deal with. You conclude very tragically, like Ajax in his raving; "I will proclaim to heaven and earth the injustice, the villany, the perfidiousness and cruelty of these men, and will deliver them over convicted to all posterity." O flowers! that such a witless, senseless bawler, one that was born but to spoil or transcribe good authors, should think himself able to write any thing of his own, that will reach posterity, whom together with his frivolous scribbles, the very next age will bury in oblivion; unless this defence of the king perhaps may be beholden to the answer I give to it, for being looked into now and then. And I would entreat the illustrious states of Holland to take off their prohibition, and suffer the book to be publicly sold. For when I have detected the vanity, ignorance, and falshood, that it is full of, the farther it spreads, the more effectually it will be suppressed. Now let us hear how he convicts us.

A D E F E N C E

OF THE

PEOPLE of ENGLAND.

CHAP. I.

I Persuade myself, Salmasius, that you being a vain flashy man, are not a little proud of being the king of Great Britain's defender, who himself was stiled the "Defender of the Faith." For my part, I think you deserve your titles both alike; for the king defended the faith, and you have defended him so, that betwixt you, you have spoiled both your causes: which I shall make appear throughout the whole ensuing discourse, and particularly in this very chapter. You told us in the 12th page of your preface, that "so good and so just a cause ought not to be embellished with any flourishes of rhetoric; that the king needed no other defence, than by a bare narrative of his story:" and yet in your first chapter, in which you had promised us that bare narrative, you neither tell the story right, nor do you abstain from making use of all the skill you have in rhetoric to set it off. So that, if we must take your own judgment, we must believe the king's cause to be neither good nor just. But by the way I would advise you not to have so good an opinion of yourself (for no body else has so of you) as to imagine that you are able to speak well upon any subject, who can neither play the part of an orator, nor an historian, nor express yourself in a stile that would not be ridiculous even in a lawyer; but like a mountebank's jugler, with big swelling words in your preface, you raised our expectation, as if some mighty matter were to ensue: in which your design was not so much to introduce a true narrative of the king's story, as to make your own empty intended flourishes go off the better. For "being now about to give us an account of the matter of fact, you find yourself encompassed and affrighted with so many monsters of novelty, that you are at a loss what to say first, what next, and what last of all." I'll tell you what the matter is with you. In the first place, you find yourself affrighted and astonished at your own monstrous lyes, and then you find that empty head of yours not encompassed, but carried round with so many trifles and fooleries, that you not only now do not, but never did know what was fit to be spoken, and in what method. "Among the many difficulties that you find in expressing the heinousness of so incredible a piece of impiety, this one offers itself, you say, which is easily said, and must often be repeated; to wit, that the sun itself never beheld a more outrageous action." But by your good leave, Sir, the sun has beheld many things, that blind Bernard never saw. But we are content you should mention the sun over and over. And it will be a piece of prudence in you so to do. For though our wickedness does not require it, the coldness of the defence that you are making, does. "The original of kings, you say, is as ancient as that of the sun." May the gods and goddesses, Damasippus, bless thee with an everlasting solstice; that thou mayest always be warm, thou that canst not stir a foot without the sun. Perhaps you would avoid the imputation of being called a doctor Umbraticus. But alas! you are in perfect darkness, that make no difference betwixt a

paternal

paternal power, and a regal: and that when you had called kings fathers of their country, could fancy that with that metaphor you had persuaded us that whatever is applicable to a father, is so to a king. Alas! there is a great difference betwixt them. Our fathers begot us. Our king made not us, but we him. Nature has given fathers to us all, but we ourselves appointed our own king. So that the people is not for the king, but the king for them. "We bear with a father, though he be harsh and severe;" and so we do with a king. But we do not bear with a father, if he be a tyrant. If a father murder his son, he himself must die for it; and why should not a king be subject to the same law, which certainly is a most just one? Especially considering that a father cannot by any possibility divest himself of that relation, but a king easily may make himself neither king nor father of his people. If this action of ours be considered according to its quality, as you call it, I, who am both an Englishman born, and was an eye-witness of the transactions of these times, tell you, who are both a foreigner and an utter stranger to our affairs; that we have put to death neither a good nor a just, nor a merciful, nor a devout, nor a godly, nor a peaceable king, as you stile him; but an enemy, that has been so to us almost ten years to an end; nor one that was a father, but a destroyer of his country. You confess that such things have been practised; for yourself have not the impudence to deny it: but not by protestants upon a protestant king. As if he deserved the name of a protestant, that in a letter to the pope, could give him the title of Most Holy Father; that was always more favourable to the papists than to those of his own profession. And being such, he is not the first of his own family that has been put to death by protestants. Was not his grandmother deposed and banished, and at last beheaded by protestants? And were not her own countrymen, that were protestants too, well enough pleased with it? Nay, if I should say they were parties to it, I should not lye. But there being so few protestant kings, it is no great wonder, if it never happened that one of them has been put to death. But that it is lawful to depose a tyrant, and to punish him according to his deserts; nay, that this is the opinion of very eminent divines, and of such as have been most instrumental in the late reformation, do you deny it if you dare. You confess that many kings have come to an unnatural death: Some by the sword, some poisoned, some strangled, and some in a dungeon; but for a king to be arraigned in a court of judicature, to be put to plead for his life, to have sentence of death pronounced against him, and that sentence executed; this you think a more lamentable instance than all the rest, and make it a prodigious piece of impiety. Tell me, thou superlative fool, whether it be not more just, more agreeable to the rules of humanity, and the laws of all human societies, to bring a criminal, be his offence what it will, before a court of justice, to give him leave to speak for himself; and, if the law condemn him, then to put him to death as he has deserved, so as he may have time to repent or to recollect himself; than presently, as soon as ever he is taken, to butcher him without more ado? Do you think there is a malefactor in the world, that if he might have his choice, would not chuse to be thus dealt withal? And if this sort of proceeding against a private person be accounted the fairer of the two, why should it not be counted so against a prince? Nay, why should we not think that himself liked it better? You would have had him killed privately, and none to have seen it, either that future ages might have lost the advantage of so good an example; or that they that did this glorious action, might seem to have avoided the light, and to have acted contrary to law and justice. You aggravate the matter by telling us, that it was not done in an uproar, or brought about by any faction amongst great men, or in the heat of a rebellion, either of the people, or the soldiers: that there was no hatred, no fear, no ambition, no blind precipitate rashness in the case; but that it was long consulted on, and done with deliberation. You did well in leaving off being an * Advocate, and turn Grammarian, who from the accidents and circumstances of a thing, which in themselves considered sway neither one way nor other, argue in dispraise of it, before you.

* Salmasius was once an advocate, that is, a counsellor at law.

have proved the thing itself to be either good or bad. See how open you lie: If the action you are discoursing of, be commendable and praise-worthy, they that did it deserve the greater honour, in that they were prepossessed with no passions, but did what they did for virtue's sake. If there were great difficulty in the enterprize, they did well in not going about it rashly, but upon advice and consideration. Tho' for my own part, when I call to mind with how unexpected an importunity and fervency of mind, and with how unanimous a consent, the whole army, and a great part of the people from almost every county in the kingdom, cried out with one voice for justice against the king, as being the sole author of all their calamities: I cannot but think that these things were brought about by a divine impulse. Whatever the matter was, whether we consider the magistrates, or the body of the people, no men ever undertook with more courage, and which our adversaries themselves confess, in a more sedate temper of mind, so brave an action, an action that might have become those famous heroes of whom we read in former ages; an action, by which they enobled not only laws, and their execution, which seem for the future equally restored to high and low against one another; but even justice, and to have rendered it after so signal a judgment, more illustrious and greater than in its own self. We are now come to an end of the 3d page of the first book, and have not the bare narrative he promised us yet. He complains that our principles are, that a king whose government is burthensome and odious, may lawfully be deposed: And "by this doctrine," says he, "if they had had a king a thousand times better than they had, they would not have spared his life." Observe the man's subtle way of arguing. For I would willingly be informed what consequence there is in this, unless he allows, that a king's government may be burdensome and odious, who is a thousand times better than our king was. So that now he has brought things to this pass, to make the king that he defends, a thousand times worse than some whose government notwithstanding is burthensome and odious, that is, it may be, the most monstrous tyrant that ever reigned. I wish ye joy, O ye kings, of so able a defender! Now the narrative begins. "They put him to several sorts of torments." Give an instance. "They removed him from prison to prison;" and so they might lawfully do; for having been a tyrant, he became an open enemy, and was taken in war. "Often changing his keepers." Left they themselves should change. "Sometimes they gave him hopes of liberty; nay, and sometimes even of restoring him to his crown, upon articles of agreement." It seems then the taking away his life, was not done upon so much premeditation, as he talked of before; and that we did not lay hold on all opportunities and means, that offered themselves, to renounce our king. Those things that in the beginning of the war we demanded of him, when he had almost brought us under, which things if they were denied us, we could enjoy no liberty, nor live in any safety; those very things we petitioned him for when he was our prisoner, in a humble, submissive way, not once, nor twice, but thrice, and oftener, and were as often denied. When we had now lost all hopes of the king's complying with us, then was that noble order of parliament made, that from that time forward, there should no articles be sent to the king; so that we left off applying ourselves to him, not from the time that he began to be a tyrant, but from the time that we found him incurable. But afterward some parliament-men set upon a new project, and meeting with a convenient opportunity to put it in practice, pass a vote to send further proposals once more to the king. Whose wickedness and folly nearest resembles that of the Roman senate, who contrary to the opinion of M. Tullius, and all honest men, voted to send ambassadors to M. Anthony; and the event had been the same, but that it pleased God Almighty in his providence, to order it otherwise, and to assert our liberty, though he suffered them to be enslaved: For tho' the king did not agree to any thing that might conduce to a firm peace, and settlement of things more than he had before, they go and vote themselves satisfied. Then the sounder part of the house finding themselves and the commonwealth betrayed, implore the aid of that valiant and always faithful army
to

the commonwealth. Upon which occasion I can observe only this, which yet I am loth to utter; to wit, that our soldiers understood themselves better than our senators, and that they saved the commonwealth by their arms, when the other by their votes had almost ruined it. Then he relates a great many things in a doleful, lamentable strain; but he does it so senselessly, that he seems rather to beg of his readers that they would be sorrowful, than to stir up any such passion in them. It grieves him "to think that the king should undergo a capital punishment after such a manner as no other king ever had done." Though he had often told us before, that there never was a king that underwent a capital punishment at all. Do you use to compare ways and manners, ye coxcomb, when you have no things, nor actions to compare with one another? "He suffered death," says he, "as a robber, as a murderer, as a parricide, as a traitor, as a tyrant." Is this defending the king? Or is it not rather giving a more severe sentence against him than that that we gave? How came you so all on a sudden to be of our mind? He complains "that executioners in vizards" [personati carnifices] "cut off the king's head." What shall we do with this fellow? He told us before, of "a murder committed on one in the disguise of a king:" [in Personâ Regis] Now he says, it was done in the disguise of an executioner. It were to no purpose to take particular notice of every silly thing he says. He tells stories of "boxes on the ear, and kicks, that," he says, "were given the king by common soldiers, and that it was four shillings a-piece to see his dead body." These, and such like stories, which partly are false, and partly impertinent, betray the ignorance and childishness of our poor scholar; but are far from making any reader ever a whit the sadder. In good faith his son Charles had done better to have hired some ballad-singer to have bewailed his father's misfortunes, than this doleful, shall I call him, or rather most ridiculous orator, who is so dry and insipid, that there's not the least spirit in any thing he says. Now the narrative's done, and it is hard to say what he does next, he runs on so fordidly and irregular. Now he's angry, then he wonders; he neither cares what he talks, nor how; repeats the same things ten times over, that could not but look ill, though he had said them but once. And I persuade myself, the extemporary rhymes of some antic jack-pudding may deserve printing better; so far am I from thinking aught he says worthy of a serious answer. I pass by his stiling the king a "Protector of Religion," who chose to make war upon the church, rather than part with those church-tyrants, and enemies of all religion, the bishops; and how is it possible that he should "maintain religion in its purity," that was himself a slave to those impure traditions and ceremonies of theirs? And for our "Sectaries, whose sacrilegious meetings," you say, "have public allowance;" instance in any of their principles, the profession of which is not openly allowed of, and countenanced in Holland. But in the mean time, there's not a more sacrilegious wretch in nature than yourself, that always took liberty to speak ill of all sorts of people. "They could not wound the commonwealth more dangerously than by taking off its master." Learn, ye abject, home-born slave; unless ye take away the master, ye destroy the commonwealth. That that has a master, is one man's property. The word master denotes a private, not a public relation. "They persecute most unjustly those ministers that abhorred this action of theirs." Lest you should not know what ministers he means, I will tell you in a few words what manner of men they were; they were those very men, that by their writings and sermons justified taking up arms against the king, and stirred the people up to it: That daily cursed, as Deborah did Meroz, all such as would not furnish the parliament either with arms, or men, or money. That taught the people out of their pulpits, that they were not about to fight against a king, but a greater tyrant than either Saul or Ahab ever were; nay, more a Nero than Nero himself. As soon as the bishops, and those clergymen, whom they daily inveighed against, and branded with the odious names of pluralists and non-residents, were taken out of their way, they presently jump, some into two, some into three of their best benefices; being now warm themselves,

they

they soon unworthily neglected their charge. Their covetousness brake through all restraints of modesty and religion, and themselves now labour under the same infamy, that they had loaded their predecessors with; and because their covetousness is not yet satisfied, and their ambition has accustomed them to raise tumults, and be enemies to peace, they cannot rest at quiet yet, but preach up sedition against the magistracy, as it is now established, as they had formerly done against the king. They now tell the people that he was cruelly murdered; upon whom themselves having heaped all their curses, had devoted him to destruction, whom they had delivered up as it were to the parliament, to be despoiled of his royalty, and pursued with a holy war. They now complain that the sectaries are not extirpated; which is a most absurd thing to expect the magistrates should be able to do, who never yet were able, do what they could, to extirpate avarice and ambition, those two most pernicious heresies, and more destructive to the church than all the rest, out of the very order and tribe of the ministers themselves. For the sects which they inveigh against, I confess there are such amongst us, but they are obscure, and make no noise in the world: The sects that they are of, are public and notorious, and much more dangerous to the church of God. Simon Magus and Diotrophes were the ring-leaders of them. Yet are we so far from persecuting these men, though they are pestilent enough, that though we know them to be ill-affected to the government, and desirous of, and endeavouring to work a change, we allow them but too much liberty. You, that are both a Frenchman and a vagabond, seem displeased that "the English more fierce and cruel than their own mastiffs," as your barking eloquence has it, "have no regard to the lawful successor and heir of the crown: Take no care of the king's youngest son, nor of the queen of Bohemia." I'll make ye no answer; you shall answer yourself. "When the frame of a government is changed from a monarchy to any other, the new modellers have no regard to succession:" the application is easy; it's in your book *De primatu Papæ*. "The great change throughout three kingdoms," you say, "was brought about by a small number of men in one of them." If this were true, that small number of men would have deserved to have dominion over the rest; valiant men over faint-hearted cowards. "These are they that presumptuously took upon them to change," *antiquum regni regimen, in alium qui à pluribus tyrannis teneatur*. It is well for them that you cannot find fault with them, without committing a barbarous Solæcism; you shame all Grammarians. "The English will never be able to wash out this stain." Nay, you, though a blot and a stain to all learned men, were never yet able to stain the renown and everlasting glory of the English nation, that with so great a resolution, as we hardly find the like recorded in any history, having struggled with, and overcome, not only their enemies in the field, but the superstitious persuasions of the common people, have purchased to themselves in general amongst all posterity the name of deliverers: The body of the people having undertook and performed an enterprize, which in other nations is thought to proceed only from a magnanimity that is peculiar to heroes. What "the protestants and primitive christians" have done, or would do upon such an occasion, I will tell ye hereafter, when we come to debate the merits of the cause: In discoursing it before, I should be guilty of your fault, who outdo the most impertinent talkers in nature. You wonder how we shall be able to answer the Jesuits. Meddle with your own matters, you runagate, and be ashamed of your actions, since the church is ashamed of you; who, though but of late you set yourself so fiercely and with so much ostentation against the pope's supremacy and episcopal government, are now become yourself a very creature of the bishops. You confess that "some protestants whom you do not name, have asserted it lawful to depose a tyrant:" But though you do not think fit to name them, I will, because you say "they are far worse than the very jesuits themselves;" they are no other than Luther, and Zuinglius, and Calvin, and Bucer, and Pareus, and many others. "But then," you say, "they refer it to the judgment of learned and wise men, who shall be accounted a tyrant. But what for

for men, were these? Were they wise men, were they men of learning? Were they any-wise remarkable, either for virtue or nobility?" You may well allow a people that has felt the heavy yoke of slavery, to be wise, and learned, and noble enough to know what is fit to be done to the tyrant that has oppressed them; though they neither consult with Foreigners nor Grammarians. But that this man was a tyrant, not only the parliaments of England and Scotland have declared by their actions and express words; but almost all the people of both nations assented to it, till such time as by the tricks and artifices of the bishops they were divided into two factions: and what if it has pleased God to chuse such men, to execute his vengeance upon the greatest potentates on earth, as he chose to be made partakers of the benefit of the gospel? "Not many wise, not many learned, not many powerful, not many noble: that by those that are not, he might bring to naught those that are; and that no flesh might glory in his sight." And who are you that babble to the contrary? dare you affect the reputation of a learned man? I confess you are pretty well versed in phrase-books, and lexicons, and glossaries; insomuch that you seem to have spent your time in nothing else. But you do not make appear that you have read any good authors with so much judgment as to have benefited by them. Other copies and various lections and words omitted, and corruptions of texts and the like, these you are full of; but no footstep of any solid learning appears in all you have writ: Or do ye think yourself a wise man, that quarrel and contend about the meanest trifles that may be? That being altogether ignorant in astronomy and physick, yet are always railing at the professors of both, whom all men credit in what things belong to their own sciences, that would be ready to curse them to the pit of hell, that should offer to deprive you of the vain-glory of having corrected or supplied the least word or letter in any copy you have criticised upon. And yet you are mad to hear yourself called a Grammarian. In a certain trifling discourse of yours, you call Dr. Hammond knave in plain terms, who was one of this king's chaplains, and one that he valued above all the rest, for no other reason but because he had called you a Grammarian. And I do not question but you would have been as ready to have thrown the same reproach upon the king himself, if you had heard that he had approved his chaplain's judgment of you. Take notice now, how much I (who am but one of those many English, that you have the impudence to call mad-men, and unlearned, and ignoble, and wicked) slight and despise you, (for that the English nation in general should take any notice in public of such a worm as you are, would be an infinite undervaluing of themselves) who though one should turn you topsyturvy, and inside out, are but a Grammarian: Nay, as if you had made a foolisher wish than Midas did, whatever you meddle with, except when you make Solæcisms, is Grammar still. Whosoever therefore he be, though from among the dregs of that common people that you are so keen upon, (for as for those men of eminency amongst us, whose great actions evidenced to all men their nobility, and virtue, and conduct, I wont disgrace them so much, as to compare you to them, or them to you) but whosoever, I say, among the dregs of that common people has but sucked in this principle, that he was not born for his prince, but for God and his country; he deserves the reputation of a learned, and an honest, and a wise man more, and is of greater use in the world than yourself. For such a one is learned without letters; you have letters, but no learning, that understand so many languages, turn over so many volumes, and yet are but asleep when all is done.

C H A P. II.

THE Argument that Salmasius, toward the conclusion of his first chapter, urged as irrefragable, to wit, that it was really so, because all men unanimously agreed in it; that very argument, than which, as he applied it, there is nothing more false, I that am now about to discourse of the right of kings, may turn upon himself with a great deal of truth. For, whereas he defines "a king" (if that may be said to be defined which he makes infinite) "to be a person in whom the supreme power of the kingdom resides, who is answerable to God alone, who may do whatsoever pleases him, who is bound by no law:" I will undertake to demonstrate, not by mine, but by his own reasons and authorities, that there never was a nation or people of any account (for to ransack all the uncivilized parts of the world were to no purpose) that ever allowed this to be their king's right, or put such exorbitant power into his hand, as "that he should not be bound by any law, that he might do what he would, that he should judge all, but be judged of none. Nor can I persuade myself, that there ever was any one person besides Salmasius of so slavish a spirit, as to assert the outrageous enormities of tyrants to be the rights of kings. Those amongst us that were the greatest royalists, always abhorred this fordid opinion: And Salmasius himself, as appears by some other writings of his before he was bribed, was quite of another mind. Infomuch, that what he here gives out, does not look like the dictates of a free subject under a free government, much less in so famous a commonwealth as that of Holland, and the most eminent university there; but seems to have been penned by some despicable slave that lay rotting in a prison, or a dungeon. If whatever a king has a mind to do, the right of kings will bear him out in (which was a lesson that the bloody tyrant Antoninus Caracalla, though his step-mother Julia preached it to him, and endeavoured to inure him to the practice of it, by making him commit incest with herself, yet could hardly suck in) then there neither is, nor ever was that king that deserved the name of a tyrant. They may safely violate all the laws of God and man: their very being kings keeps them innocent. What crime was ever any of them guilty of? They did but make use of their own right upon their own vassals. No king can commit such horrible cruelties and outrages, as will not be within this right of kings. So that there's no pretence left for any complaints or expostulations with any of them. And dare you assert, that "this right of kings," as you call it, "is grounded upon the law of nations, or rather upon that of nature," you brute beast? for you deserve not the name of a man, that are so cruel and unjust towards all those of your own kind; that endeavour as much as in you lies, so to bear down and vilify the whole race of mankind, that were made after the image of God, as to assert and maintain that those cruel and unmerciful taskmasters, that through the superstitious whimsies, or sloth, or treachery of some persons, get into the chair, are provided and appointed by nature herself, that mild and gentle mother of us all, to be the governors of those nations they enslave. By which pestilent doctrine of yours, having rendered them more fierce and untractable, you not only enable them to make havoc of, and trample under foot their miserable subjects; but endeavour to arm them for that very purpose with the law of nature, the right of kings, and the very constitutions of government, than which nothing can be more impious or ridiculous. By my consent, as Dionysius formerly of a tyrant became a school-master, so you of a grammarian should become a tyrant; not that you may have that regal licence of doing other people harm, but a fair opportunity of perishing miserably yourself: That, as Tiberius complained, when he had confined himself to the island Capreae, you may be reduced into such a condition, as to be sensible that you perish daily. But let us look a little more narrowly into this right of kings that you talk of. "This was the sense of the Eastern,

eastern, and of the western part of the world." I shall not answer you with what Aristotle and Cicero, (who are both as credible authors as any we have) tell us, viz. That the people of Asia easily submit to slavery, but the Syrians and the Jews are even born to it from the womb. I confess there are but few, and those men of great wisdom and courage, that are either desirous of liberty, or capable of using it. The greatest part of the world chuse to live under masters; but yet they would have them just ones. As for such as are unjust and tyrannical, neither was God ever so much an enemy to mankind, as to enjoin a necessity of submitting to them; nor was there ever any people so destitute of all sense, and sunk into such a depth of despair, as to impose so cruel a law upon themselves and their posterity. First, you produce "the words of king Solomon in his Ecclesiastes." And we are as willing to appeal to the scripture as you. As for Solomon's authority, we will consider that hereafter, when perhaps we shall be better able to understand it. First, let us hear God himself speak, Deut. xvii. 14. "When thou art come into the land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as the nations that are round about me." Which passage I could wish all men would seriously consider: for hence it appears by the testimony of God himself; first, that all nations are at liberty to erect what form of government they will amongst themselves, and to change it when and into what they will. This God affirms in express terms concerning the Hebrew nation; and it does not appear but that other nations are, as to this respect, in the same condition. Another remark that this place yields us, is, that a commonwealth is a more perfect form of government than a monarchy, and more suitable to the condition of mankind, and in the opinion of God himself, better for his own people; for himself appointed it, and could hardly be prevailed withal a great while after, and at their own importunate desire, to let them change it into a monarchy. But to make it appear that he gave them their choice to be governed by a single person, or by more, so they were justly governed, in case they should in time to come resolve upon a king, he prescribes laws for this king of theirs to observe, whereby he was forbidden to multiply to himself horses and wives, or to heap up riches: whence he might easily infer, that no power was put into his hands over others, but according to law, since even those actions of his life, which related only to himself, were under a law. He was commanded therefore to transcribe with his own hand all the precepts of the law, and having writ them out, to observe and keep them, that his mind might not be lifted up above his brethren. It is evident from hence, that as well the prince as the people was bound by the law of Moses. To this purpose Josephus writes, a proper and an able interpreter of the laws of his own country, who was admirably well versed in the Jewish policy, and infinitely preferable to a thousand obscure ignorant rabbins: he has it thus in the fourth book of his Antiquities. *Ἀριστοκρατία μὲν ὅν κρείττερον, &c.* "An Aristocracy is the best form of government; wherefore do not you endeavour to settle any other; it is enough for you that God presides over ye, but if you will have a king, let him guide himself by the law of God, rather than by his own wisdom; and lay a restraint upon him, if he offer at more power than the state of your affairs will allow of." Thus he expresses himself upon this place in Deuteronomy. Another Jewish author, Philo Judæus, who was Josephus's contemporary, a very studious man in the law of Moses, upon which he wrote a large commentary: when in his book concerning the creation of the king, he interprets this chapter of Deuteronomy, he sets a king loose from the law no otherwise than as an enemy may be said to be so: "They," says he, "that to the prejudice and destruction of the people acquire great power to themselves, deserve not the name of kings, but that of enemies: for their actions are the same with those of an irreconcilable enemy. Nay, they, that under a pretence of government are injurious, are worse than open enemies. We may fence ourselves against the latter; but the malice of the former is so much the more pestilent, because it is not always easy to be discovered." But when it is discovered, why should they not be dealt with as enemies? The same author in his 2d book, Allegoriar.

Legis, "A king," says he, "and a tyrant, are contraries." And a little after, "A King ought not only to command, but also to obey." All this is very true, you will say, a king ought to observe the laws, as well as any other man. But what if he will not, what law is there to punish him? I answer, the same law that there is to punish other men; for I find no exceptions. There is no express law to punish the priests, or any other inferior magistrates, who all of them, if this opinion of the exemption of kings from the penalties of the law would hold, might, by the same reason, claim impunity, what guilt soever they contract, because there is no positive law for their punishment; and yet I suppose none of them ever challenged such a prerogative, nor would it ever be allowed them, if they should. Hitherto we have learned from the very text of God's own law, that a king ought to obey the laws, and not lift himself up above his brethren. Let us now consider whether Solomon preached up any other doctrine, ch. viii. ver. 2. "I counsel thee to keep the king's commandment, and that in regard of the oath of God. Be not hasty to go out of his sight; stand not in an evil thing; for he doth whatsoever pleaseth him. Where the word of a king is, there is power; and who may say unto him, what dost thou?" It is well enough known, that here the preacher directs not his precepts to the Sanhedrim, or to a parliament, but to private persons; and such he commands to "keep the king's commandment, and that in regard of the oath of God." But as they swear allegiance to kings, do not kings likewise swear to obey and maintain the laws of God, and those of their own country? So the Reubenites and Gadites promise obedience to Joshua, Josh. i. 17. "According as we hearkened unto Moses in all things, so will we hearken unto thee; only the Lord thy God be with thee, as he was with Moses." Here is an express condition. Hear the preacher else, ch. ix, ver. 17. "The words of wise men are heard in quiet, more than the cry of him that ruleth among fools." The next caution that Solomon gives us, is, "Be not hasty to go out of his sight; stand not in an evil thing; for he doth whatsoever pleaseth him." That is, he does what he will to malefactors, whom the law authorizes him to punish, and against whom he may proceed with mercy or severity, as he sees occasion. Here is nothing like tyranny; nothing that a good man needs be afraid of. "Where the word of a king is, there is power; and who may say to him, What dost thou?" And yet we read of one that not only said to a king, "What dost thou?" but told him, "Thou hast done foolishly." But Samuel, you may say, was an extraordinary person. I answer you with your own words, which follow in the forty-ninth page of your book, "What was there extraordinary," say you, "in Saul or in David?" And so say I, what was there in Samuel extraordinary? He was a prophet, you'll say; so are they that now follow his example; for they act according to the will of God, either his revealed, or his secret will, which yourself grant in your 50th page. The preacher therefore in this place prudently advises private persons not to contend with princes; for it is even dangerous to contend with any man that is either rich or powerful. But what then? must therefore the nobility of a nation, and all the inferior magistrates, and the whole body of the people not dare to mutter when a king raves and acts like a madman? Must they not oppose a foolish, wicked, outrageous tyrant, that perhaps seeks the destruction of all good men? Must they not endeavour to prevent his turning all divine and human things upside down? Must they suffer him to massacre his people, burn their cities, and commit such outrages upon them daily; and finally, to have perfect liberty to do what he lists without controul?

O de Cappadocis eques catastis!

Thou slavish knight of Cappadocia!

Whom all free people, if you can have the confidence hereafter to set your foot within a free country, ought to cast out from amongst them, and send to some remote parts of the world,

world, as a prodigy of dire portent; or to condemn to some perpetual drudgery, as one devoted to slavery, solemnly obliging themselves, if they ever let you go, to undergo a worse slavery under some cruel, silly tyrant: no man living can either devise himself, or borrow from any other, expressions so full of cruelty and contempt, as may not justly be applied to you. But go on. "When the Israelites asked a king of God, they said, they would set up a king that should have the same rule and dominion over them, that the kings of their neighbour countries exercised over their subjects. But the kings of the East we know had an unlimited power," as Virgil testifies,

" — Regem non sic Ægyptus & ingens

" Lydia, nec populi Parthorum, & Medus, Hydaspes

" Observant." —

" No Eastern nation ever did adore

" The majesty of sovereign princes more."

First, what is that to us, what sort of kings the Israelites desired? Especially since God was angry with them, not only for desiring such a king as other nations had, and not such a king as his own law describes, but barely for desiring a king at all? Nor is it credible that they should desire an unjust king, and one that should be out of the reach of all laws, who could not bear the government of Samuel's sons, though under the power of laws; but from their covetousness sought refuge in a king. And lastly, the verse that you quote out of Virgil, does not prove that the kings of the East had an absolute unlimited power; for those bees, that he there speaks of, and who reverence their kings, he says, more than the Egyptians or Medes do theirs, by the authority of the same poet:

— " Magnis agitant sub legibus ævum."

" Live under certain fundamental laws."

They do not live under a king then, that is tied to no law. But now I will let you see how little reason you have to think I bear you an ill-will. Most people think you a knave; but I will make it appear that you have only put on a knave's vizor for the present. In your introduction to your discourse of the pope's supremacy, you say, that some divines in the council of Trent made use of the government, that is said to be amongst bees, to prove the pope's supremacy. This fancy you borrow from them, and urge it here with the same malice that they did there. Now that very same answer that you gave them, whilst you were an honest man, now that you are become a knave, you shall give yourself, and pull off with your own hand that vizor you have now put on: "The bees," say you, "are a state, and so natural philosophers call them; they have a king, but a harmless one; he is a leader, or captain, rather than a king; he never beats, nor pulls, nor kills his subject bees." No wonder they are so observant of him then: but in good faith, you had but ill luck to meddle with these bees; for though they are bees of Trent, they show you to be a drone. Aristotle, a most exact writer of politics, affirms that the Asiatic monarchy, which yet himself calls barbarous, was according to law, Politic. 3. And where-as he reckons up five several sorts of monarchies, four of those five he makes governments according to laws, and with the consent of the people; and yet he calls them tyrannical forms of government, because they lodge so much power in one man's hand. But the kingdom of the Lacedæmonians, he says, is most properly a kingdom, because there all power is not in the king. The fifth sort of monarchy, which he calls *παρβασιλεια*, that is, where the king is all in all; and to which he refers that, that you call the right of kings, which is a liberty to do what they list; he neither tells us when, nor where any such form of government ever obtained. Nor seems he to have mentioned it for any other purpose than to shew how unjust, absurd, and tyrannical a government it is. You say that when Samuel would deter the people from chusing a king, he propounded to them this

Right of Kings. But whence had Samuel it? Had he it from the written law of God? That cannot be. We have observed already, that the scriptures afford us a quite other scheme of sovereignty. Had Samuel it then immediately from God himself by revelation? That is not likely neither; for God dislikes it, discommends it, finds fault with it, so that Samuel does not expound to the people any right of kings appointed by God; but a corrupt and depraved manner of governing, taken up by the pride and ambition of princes. He tells not the people what their kings ought to do, but what they would do. He told them the Manner of their king, as before he told us the Manner of the priests, the sons of Eli; for he uses the same word in both places; (which you in the thirty-third page of your book, by an Hebrew solecism too, call מִשְׁפָּט.) That manner of theirs was wicked, and odious, and tyrannical: it was no right, but great wrong. The fathers have commented upon this place too: I will instance in one, that may stand for a great many; and that is Sulpitius Severus, a contemporary and intimate friend of St. Jerome, and, in St. Augustin's opinion, a man of great wisdom and learning. He tells us in his sacred history, that Samuel in that place acquaints the people with the imperious rule of kings, and how they use to lord it over their subjects. Certainly it cannot be the right of kings to domineer and be imperious. But according to Salust, that lawful power and authority that kings were entrusted with, for the preservation of the public liberty, and the good of the commonwealth, quickly degenerated into pride and tyranny: and this is the sense of all orthodox divines, and of all lawyers upon that place of Samuel. And you might have learned from Sichardus, that most of the Rabbins too were of the same mind; at least, not any one of them ever asserted that the absolute inherent right of kings is there discoursed of. Yourself in your fifth chapter, page 106, complain, That "not only Clemens Alexandrinus, but all other expositors mistake themselves upon this text:" and you, I will warrant ye, are the only man that have had the good luck to hit the mark. Now what a piece of folly and impudence is this in you to maintain, in opposition to all orthodox expositors, that those very actions which God so much condemns, are the right of kings, and to pretend law for them? Though yourself confess, that that right is very often exercised in committing outrages, being injurious, contumelious, and the like. Was any man ever to that degree sui juris, so much his own master, as that he might lawfully prey upon mankind, bear down all that stood in his way, and turn all things upside-down? Did the Romans ever maintain, as you say they did, that any man might do these things suo jure, by virtue of some inherent right in himself? Salust indeed makes C. Memmius, a tribune of the people, in an invective speech of his against the pride of the nobility, and their escaping unpunished, howsoever they misbehaved themselves, to use these words, viz. "To do whatever one has a mind to, without fear of punishment, is to be a king." This saying you caught hold of, thinking it would make for your purpose; but consider it a little better, and you will find yourself deceived. Does he in that place assert the right of kings? or does he not blame the common people, and chide them for their sloth, in suffering their nobility to lord it over them, as if they were out of the reach of all law, and in submitting again to that kingly tyranny, which together with their kings themselves, their ancestors had lawfully and justly rejected and banished from amongst them? If you had consulted Tully, you would have understood both Salust and Samuel better. In his oration pro C. Rabirio, "There is none of us ignorant, says he, of the manner of kings. These are their lordly dictates: mind what I say, and do accordingly." Many passages to this purpose he quotes out of poets, and calls them not the right, but the custom or manner of kings; and he says, we ought to read and consider them, not only for curiosity sake, but that we may learn to beware of them, and avoid them. You perceive how miserably you are come off with Salust, who, though he be as much an enemy to tyranny as any other author whatsoever, you thought would have patronized this tyrannical right that you are establishing. Take my word for it, the right of kings seems to be tottering, and even to further

further its own ruin, by relying upon such weak props for its support; and by endeavouring to maintain itself by such examples and authorities, as would hasten its downfall, if it were further off than it is. "The extremity of right or law," you say, "is the height of injury, *Summum jus summa injuria*; this saying is verified most properly in kings, who when they go to the utmost of their right, fall into those courses, in which Samuel makes the right of kings to consist." And it is a miserable right, which, when you have said all you can for, you can no otherwise defend, than by confessing, that it is the greatest injury that may be. The extremity of right or law is said to be, when a man ties himself up to niceties, dwells upon letters and syllables, and in the mean time neglects the intent and equity of the law; or when a written law is cunningly and maliciously interpreted; this Cicero makes to have been the rise of that common saying. But since it is certain that all right flows from the fountain of justice, so that nothing can possibly be any man's right that is not just, it is a most wicked thing in you to affirm that for a king to be unjust, rapacious, tyrannical, and as ill as the worst of them ever were, is according to the right of kings; and to tell us that a holy prophet would have persuaded the people to such a senseless thing. For whether written or unwritten, whether extreme or remiss, what right can any man have to be injurious? Which, lest you should confess to be true of other men, but not of kings, I have one man's authority to object to you, who I think was a king likewise, and professes that that right of kings that you speak of, is odious both to God and himself: it is in the 94th psalm, "Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee, that frameth mischief by a law?" Be not therefore so injurious to God, as to ascribe this doctrine to him, viz. that all manner of wicked and flagitious actions are but the right of kings; since himself tells us, that he abhors all fellowship with wicked princes for this very reason, because, under pretence of sovereignty, they create misery and vexation to their subjects. Neither bring up a false accusation against a prophet of God; for by making him to teach us in this place what the right of kings is, you do not produce the right Samuel, but such another empty shadow as was raised by the witch of Endor. Though for my own part, I verily believe that that infernal Samuel would not have been so great a liar, but that he would have confessed, that what you call the right of kings, is tyranny. We read indeed of impieties countenanced by law, *Jus datum sceleri*: you yourself confess that they are bad kings that have made use of this boundless licence of theirs to do every thing. Now this right that you have introduced for the destruction of mankind, not proceeding from God, as I have proved it does not, must needs come from the devil; and that it does really so, will appear more clearly hereafter. "By virtue of this liberty, say you, princes may if they will." And for this, you pretend to have Cicero's authority. I am always willing to mention your authorities, for it generally happens that the very authors you quote them out of, give you an answer themselves. Hear else what Cicero says in his 4th Philippic, "What cause of war can be more just and warrantable than to avoid slavery? For though a people may have the good fortune to live under a gentle master, yet those are in a miserable condition whose prince may tyrannize over them if he will." May, that is, can, has power enough so to do. If he meant it of his right, he would contradict himself, and make that an unjust cause of war, which himself had affirmed with the same breath to be a most just one. It is not therefore the right of all kings that you describe, but the injuriousness, and force, and violence of some. Then you tell us what private men may do. "A private man," say you, "may lye, may be ungrateful;" and so may kings, but what then? May they therefore plunder, murder, ravish, without controul? It is equally prejudicial and destructive to the commonwealth, whether it be their own prince, or a robber, or a foreign enemy that spoils, massacres, and enslaves them. And questionless, being both alike enemies of human society, the one, as well as the other, may lawfully be opposed and punished; and their own prince the rather, because he, though raised to that dignity by the honours that his people have conferred upon him, and being bound by his oath to defend

the public safety, betrays it notwithstanding all. At last you grant, that "Moses prescribes laws, according to which the king that the people of Israel shall chuse, ought to govern, though different from this right that Samuel proposes;" which words contain a double contradiction to what you have said before. For whereas you had affirmed, that a king was bound by no law, here you confess he is. And you set up two contrary rights, one described by Moses, and another by Samuel, which is absurd. "But," says the prophet, "you shall be servants to your king." Though I should grant that the Israelites were really so, it would not presently follow, that it was the right of their kings to have them so; but that by the usurpation and injustice of most of them, they were reduced to that condition. For the prophet had foretold them, that that importunate petition of theirs would bring a punishment from God upon them; not because it would be their king's right so to harass them, but because they themselves had deserved it should be so. If kings are out of the reach of the law, so as that they may do what they list, they are more absolute than any masters, and their subjects in a more despicable condition than the worst of slaves. The law of God provided some redress for them, though of another nation, if their masters were cruel and unreasonable towards them. And can we imagine that the whole body of the people of a free nation, though oppressed and tyrannized over, and preyed upon, should be left remediless? That they had no law to protect them, no sanctuary to betake themselves to? Can we think that they were delivered from the bondage they were under to the Egyptian kings, to be reduced into a worse to one of their own brethren? All which being neither agreeable to the law of God, nor to common sense, nothing can be more evident than that the prophet declares to the people the Manner, and not the right of kings; nor the Manner of all kings, but of most. Then you come to the Rabbins, and quote two of them, but you have as bad luck with them here, as you had before. For it is plain, that that other chapter that Rabbi Joses speaks of, and which contains, he says, the right of kings, is that in Deuteronomy, and not in Samuel. For Rabbi Judas says very truly, and against you, that that discourse of Samuel's was intended only to frighten the people. It is a most pernicious doctrine to maintain that to be any one's right, which in itself is flat injustice, unless you have a mind to speak by contraries. And that Samuel intended to affrighten them, appears by the 18th verse, "And ye shall cry out in that day, because of your king, which ye shall have chosen you, and I will not hear you in that day, saith the Lord." That was to be their punishment for their obstinacy in persisting to desire a king, against the mind and will of God, and yet they are not forbidden here either to pray against him, or to endeavour to rid themselves of him. For if they might lawfully pray to God against him, without doubt they might use all lawful means for their own deliverance. For what man living, when he finds himself in any calamity, betakes himself to God, so as to neglect his own duty in order to a redress, and rely upon his lazy prayers only? But be it how it will, what is all this to the right of kings, or of the English people? who neither asked a king against the will of God, nor had one appointed us by God, but by the right that all nations have to appoint their own governors, appointed a king over us by laws of our own, neither in obedience to, nor against any command of God? And this being the case, for aught I see, we have done well in deposing our king, and are to be commended for it, since the Israelites sinned in asking one. And this the event has made appear; for we, when we had a king, prayed to God against him, and he heard us, and delivered us: but the Jews (who not being under a kingly government, desired a king,) he suffered to live in slavery under one, till, at last, after their return from the Babylonish captivity, they betook themselves to their former government again. Then you come to give us a display of your talmudical learning, but you have as ill success with that, as you have had with all the rest. For whilst you are endeavouring to prove that kings are not liable to any temporal judicature, you quote an authority out of the treatise of the Sanhedrim, "that the king neither is judged of others, nor does him-
self

self judge any." Which is against the people's own petition in Samuel; for they desired a king that might judge them. You labour in vain to salve this, by telling us, that it is to be understood of those kings that reigned after the Babylonish captivity. For then, what say ye to Maimonides? He makes this difference betwixt the kings of Israel, and those of Juda; that the kings of the posterity of David judge, and are judged; but the kings of Israel do neither. You contradict and quarrel with yourself or your Rabbins, and still do my work for me. This, say you, is not to be understood of the kings of Israel in their first institution; for in the 17th verse it is said, "you shall be his servants;" that is, he shall use you to it, not that he shall have any right to make you so. Or if you understand it of their king's right, it is but a judgment of God upon them for asking a king; the effects of which they were sensible of under most of their kings, tho' not perhaps under all. But you need no antagonists, you are such a perpetual adversary to yourself. For you tell us now a story, as if you were arguing on my side, how that first Aristobulus, and after him Jannæus, surnamed Alexander, did not receive that kingly right that they pretended to, from the Sanhedrim, that great treasury and oracle of the laws of that nation, but usurped it by degrees against the will of the senate. For whose sake, you say, that childish fable of the principal men of that assembly being struck dead by the angel Gabriel, was first invented. And thus you confess that this magnificent prerogative, upon which you seem mainly to rely, viz. "that kings are not to be judged by any upon earth, was grounded upon this worse than an old wife's tale, that is, upon a rabbinnical fable." But that the Hebrew kings were liable to be called in question for their actions, and to be punished with stripes, if they were found faulty, Sichardus shows at large out of the writings of the Rabbins, to which author you are indebted for all that you employ of that sort of learning, and yet you have the impudence to be thwarting with him. Nay, we read in the scripture that Saul thought himself bound by a decree of his own making; and in obedience thereunto, that he cast lots with his son Jonathan which of them two should die. Uzzias likewise, when he was thrust out of the temple by the priests as a leper, submitted as every private person in such a case ought to do, and ceased to be a king. Suppose he should have refused to go out of the temple, and lay down the government, and live alone, and had resolved to assert that kingly right of not being subject to any law; do you think the priests, and the people of the Jews, would have suffered the temple to be defiled, the laws violated, and live themselves in danger of the infection? It seems there are laws against a leprous king, but none against a tyrant. Can any man possibly be so mad and foolish as to fancy that the laws should so far provide for the people's health, as tho' some noisome distemper should seize upon the king himself, yet to prevent the infection's reaching them, and make no provision for the security of their lives and estates, and the very being of the whole state, against the tyranny of a cruel, unjust prince, which is incomparably the greater mischief of the two? "But," say you, "there can be no precedent shown of any one king, that has been arraigned in a court of justice, and condemned to die." Sichardus answers that well enough. It is all one, says he, as if one should argue on this manner: The emperor of Germany never was summoned to appear before one of the prince-electors; therefore if the prince elector Palatine should impeach the emperor, he were not bound to plead to it; tho' it appears by the golden bull, that Charles the Fourth subjected himself and his successors to that cognizance and jurisdiction. But no wonder if kings were indulged in their ambition, and their exorbitances passed by, when the times were so corrupt and depraved, that even private men, if they had either money or interest, might escape the law, tho' guilty of crimes of never so high a nature. That *ἀντιστάσις*, that you speak of, that is to be wholly independent upon any other, and accountable to none upon earth, which you say is peculiar to the majesty of sovereign princes, Aristotle in the 4th book of his Pol. Ch. 10. calls a most tyrannical form of government, and not in the least to be endured by a free people. And that kings are not liable to be questioned for their actions, you prove by
the

the testimony of a very worthy author, that barbarous tyrant Mark Antony; one of those that subverted the commonwealth of Rome: And yet he himself, when he undertook an expedition against the Parthians, summoned Herod before him, to answer to a charge of murder, and would have punished him, but that Herod bribed him. So that Antony's asserting this prerogative royal, and your Defence of King Charles, come both out of one and the same spring. "And it is very reasonable," say you, "that it should be so; for kings derive their authority from God alone." What kings are those, I pray, that do so? For I deny that there ever were any such kings in the world, that derived their authority from God alone. Saul the first king of Israel had never reigned, but that the people desired a king, even against the will of God; and tho' he was proclaimed king once at Mizpah, yet after that he lived a private life, and looked to his father's cattle, till he was created so the second time by the people at Gilgal. And what think ye of David? Tho' he had been anointed once by God, was he not anointed the second time in Hebron by the tribe of Judah, and after that by all the people of Israel, and that after a mutual covenant betwixt him and them? 2 Sam. v. 1 Chron. xi. Now a covenant lays an obligation upon kings, and restrains them within bounds. Solomon, you say, "succeeded him in the throne of the Lord, and was acceptable to all men:" 1 Chron. xxix. So that it is something to be well-pleasing in the eyes of the people. Jehoiadah the priest made Joash king, but first he made him and the people enter into a covenant to one another, 2 Kings xi. I confess that these kings, and all that reigned of David's posterity, were appointed to the kingdom both by God and the people; but of all other kings, of what country soever, I affirm, that they are made so by the people only; nor can you make it appear, that they are appointed by God any otherwise than as all other things, great and small, are said to be appointed by him, because nothing comes to pass without his providence. So that I allow the throne of David was in a peculiar manner called, "the throne of the Lord:" whereas the thrones of other princes are no otherwise God's, than all other things in the world are his; which if you would, you might have learnt out of the same chapter, ver. 11. 12. "Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, &c. for all that is in the heaven, and in the earth is thine. Both riches and honour come of thee, and thou reignest over all." And this is so often repeated, not to puff up kings, but to put them in mind, tho' they think themselves Gods, that yet there is a God above them, to whom they owe whatever they are and have. And thus we easily understand what the poets, and the Essenes among the Jews mean, when they tell us, that it is by God that kings reign, and that they are of Jupiter; for so all of us are of God, we are all his off-spring. So that this universal right of Almighty God's, and the interest that he has in princes, and their thrones, and all that belongs to them, does not at all derogate from the people's right; but that notwithstanding all this, all other kings, not particularly and by name appointed by God, owe their sovereignty to the people only, and consequently are accountable to them for the management of it. The truth of which doctrine, tho' the common people are apt to flatter their kings, yet they themselves acknowledge, whether good ones, as Sarpedon in Homer is described to have been; or bad ones, as those tyrants in the lyrick poet:

Γλαῦκε, τίη δὴ νῦν τιμήμεθα, μάρις, &c.

Glaucus, in Lycia we're ador'd like Gods:

What makes 'twixt us and others so great odds?

He resolves the question himself: "Because, says he, we excel others in heroical virtues: Let us fight manfully then, says he, lest our countrymen tax us with sloth and cowardice." In which words he intimates to us, both that kings derive their grandeur from the people, and that for their conduct and behaviour in war, they are accountable to them. Bad kings indeed, tho' to cast some terror into people's minds, and beget

a reverence of themselves, they declare to the world, that God only is the author of kingly government; in their hearts and minds they reverence no other deity but that of Fortune, according to that passage in Horace:

Te Dacus asper, te profugi Scythæ,
Regumque matres barbarorum, &
Purpurei metuunt Tyranni.
Injurioso ne pede proruas
Stantem columnam, neu populus frequens
Ad arma cessantes, ad arma
Concitet, imperiumque frangat.

“ All barb'rous people, and their princes too,
“ All purple tyrants honour you;
“ The very wandring Scythians do.
“ Support the pillar of the Roman state,
“ Lest all men be involv'd in one man's fate.
“ Continue us in wealth and peace;
“ Let wars and tumults ever cease.”

So that if it is by God that kings now-a-days reign, it is by God too that the people assert their own liberty; since all things are of him, and by him. I'm sure the scripture bears witness to both; that by him kings reign, and that by him they are cast down from their thrones. And yet experience teaches us, that both these things are brought about by the people, oftner than by God. Be this right of kings, therefore, what it will, the right of the people is as much from God as it. And whenever any people, without some visible designation of God himself, appoint a king over them, they have the same right to put him down, that they had to set him up at first. And certainly it is a more god-like action to depose a tyrant, than to set up one: And there appears much more of God in the people, when they depose an unjust prince, than in a king that oppresses an innocent people. Nay, the people have a warrant from God to judge wicked princes; for God has conferred this very honour upon those that are dear to him, that celebrating the praises of Christ their own king, ‘they shall bind in chains the kings of the nations, (under which appellation all tyrants under the gospel are included) and execute the judgments written upon them that challenge to themselves an exemption from all written laws,’ Psalm cxlix. So that there is but little reason left for that wicked and foolish opinion, that kings, who commonly are the worst of men, should be so high in God's account, as that he should have put the world under them, to be at their beck, and be governed according to their humour; and that for their sakes alone he should have reduced all mankind, whom he made after his own image, into the same condition with brutes. After all this, rather than say nothing, you produce M. Aurelius, as a countenancer of tyranny; but you had better have let him alone. I can't say whether he ever affirmed, that princes are accountable only before God's tribunal. But Xiphiline indeed, out of whom you quote those words of M. Aurelius, mentions a certain government, which he calls an Autarchy, of which he makes God the only judge: *περί αὐταρχίας ὁ Θεὸς μόνος κρίνειν δύναται*. But that this word Autarchy and Monarchy are synonymous, I cannot easily persuade myself to believe. And the more I read what goes before, the less I find myself inclinable to think so. And certainly whoever considers the context, will not easily apprehend what coherence this sentence has with it, and must needs wonder how it comes so abruptly into the text; especially since Marcus Aurelius, that mirror of princes, carried himself towards the people, as Capitolinus tells us, just as if Rome had been a commonwealth still.

And we all know that when it was so, the supreme power was in the people. The same emperor honoured the memory of Thraseas, and Helvidius, and Cato, and Dio, and Brutus; who all were tyrant-slayers, or affected the reputation of being thought so. In the first book that he writes of his own life, he says that he proposed to himself a form of government, under which all men might equally enjoy the benefit of the law, and right and justice be equally administered to all. And in his fourth book he says, the law is master, and not he. He acknowledged the right of the senate and the people, and their interest in all things: We are so far, says he, from having any thing of our own, that we live in your houses. These things Xiphiline relates of him. So little did he arrogate aught to himself by virtue of his sovereign right. When he died, he recommended his son to the Romans for his successor, if they should think he deserved it. So far was he from pretending to a commission from heaven to exercise that absolute and imaginary right of sovereignty, that Autarchy, that you tell us of. "All the Latin and Greek books are full of authorities of this nature." But we have heard none of them yet. "So are the Jewish authors." And yet, you say, "the Jews in many things allowed but too little to their princes." Nay, you'll find that both the Greeks and the Latins allowed much less to tyrants. And how little the Jews allowed them, would appear, if that book that Samuel "wrote of the manner of the kingdom" were extant; which book the Hebrew doctors tell us, their kings tore in pieces and burnt, that they might be more at liberty to tyrannize over the people without controul or fear of punishment. Now look about ye again, and catch hold of somewhat or other. In the last place you come to wrest David's words in the xvii. Psalm, "let my sentence come forth from thy presence." Therefore, says Barnachmoni, "God only can judge the king." And yet it is most likely that David penned this Psalm when he was persecuted by Saul, at which time, though himself were anointed, he did not decline being judged even by Jonathan: "Notwithstanding, if there be iniquity in me, slay me thyself." 1 Sam xx. At least in this psalm he does no more than what any person in the world would do upon the like occasion, being falsely accused by men, he appeals to the judgment of God himself, "let thine eyes look upon the thing that is right; thou hast proved and visited mine heart, &c." What relation has this to a temporal judicature? Certainly they do no good office to this right of kings, that thus discover the weakness of its foundation. Then you come with that threadbare argument, which of all others is most in vogue with our courtiers, "against thee, thee only have I sinned," Psalm li. 6. As if David in the midst of his repentance, when overwhelmed with sorrow, and almost drowned in tears, he was humbly imploring God's mercy, had any thoughts of this kingly right of his when his heart was so low, that he thought he deserved not the right of a slave. And can we think that he despised all the people of God, his own brethren, to that degree, as to believe that he might murder them, plunder them, and commit adultery with their wives, and yet not sin against them all this while? So holy a man could never be guilty of such insufferable pride, nor have so little knowledge either of himself, or of his duty to his neighbour. So without doubt, when he says, "against thee only," he meant, against thee chiefly have I sinned, &c. But whatever he means, the words of a psalm are too full of poetry, and this psalm too full of passion, to afford us any exact definitions of right and justice; nor is it proper to argue any thing of that nature from them. "But David was never questioned for this, nor made to plead for his life before the Sanhedrim." What then? How should they know that any such thing had been which was done so privately, that perhaps for some years after not above one or two were privy to it, as such secrets there are in most courts? 2 Sam. 12. "Thou hast done this thing in secret." Besides, what if the senate should neglect to punish private persons? Would any infer that therefore they ought not to be punished at all? But the reason why David was not proceeded against as a malefactor, is not much in the dark: He had condemned himself in the 5th verse, "The man that hath done

this thing shall surely die." To which the prophet presently replies, "Thou art the man." So that in the prophet's judgment as well as his own, he was worthy of death; but God by his sovereign right over all things, and of his great mercy to David, absolves him from the guilt of his sin, and the sentence of death which he had pronounced against himself; verse 13th, "The Lord hath put away thy sin, thou shalt not die." The next thing you do is to rail at some bloody advocate or other, and you take a deal of pains to refute the conclusion of his discourse. Let him look to that; I will endeavour to be as short as I can in what I have undertaken to perform. But some things I must not pass by without taking notice of; as first and foremost your notorious contradictions; for in the 30th page you say, "The Israelites do not deprecate an unjust, rapacious, tyrannical king, one as bad as the worst of kings are." And yet, page 42. you are very smart upon your advocate, for maintaining that the Israelites asked for a tyrant: "Would they have leaped out of the frying-pan into the fire," say you, "and groan under the cruelty of the worst of tyrants, rather than live under bad judges, especially being used to such a form of government?" First you said the Hebrews would rather live under tyrants than judges, here you say they would rather live under judges than tyrants; and that "they desired nothing less than a tyrant." So that your advocate may answer you out of your own book. For according to your principles it is every king's right to be a tyrant. What you say next is very true, "the supreme power was then in the people, which appears by their own rejecting their judges, and making choice of a kingly government." Remember this when I shall have occasion to make use of it. You say, that God gave the children of Israel a king as a thing good and profitable for them, and deny that he gave them one in his anger, as a punishment for their sin. But that will receive an easy answer; for to what purpose should they cry to God because of the king that they had chosen, if it were not because a kingly government is an evil thing; not in itself, but because it most commonly does, as Samuel forewarns the people that theirs would, degenerate into pride and tyranny? If you are not yet satisfied, hark what you say yourself; acknowledge your own hand, and blush; it is in your "Apparatus ad Primatum: God gave them a king in his anger," say you, "being offended at their sin in rejecting him from ruling over them; and so the christian church, as a punishment for its forsaking the pure worship of God, has been subjected to the more than kingly government of one mortal head." So that if your own comparison holds, either God gave the children of Israel a king as an evil thing, and as a punishment; or he has set up the pope for the good of the church. Was there ever any thing more light and mad than this man is? Who would trust him in the smallest matters, that in things of so great concern says and unsays without any consideration in the world? You tell us in your twenty-ninth page, "that by the constitution of all nations, kings are bound by no law." That "this had been the judgment both of the eastern and western part of the world." And yet page 43. you say, "That all the kings of the east ruled *κατὰ νόμον*, according to law, nay that the very kings of Egypt in all matters whatsoever, whether great or small, were tied to laws." Though in the beginning of this chapter you had undertook to demonstrate, That "kings are bound by no laws, that they give laws to others, but have none prescribed to themselves." For my part I have no reason to be angry with you, for either you are mad, or of our side. You do not defend the king's cause, but argue against him, and play the fool with him: or if you are in earnest, that epigram of Catullus,

Tantò pessimus omnium Poeta,
Quantò tu optimus omnium Patronus.

The worst of poets, I myself declare,
By how much you the best of patrons are.

U u u 2

That

That epigram, I say, may be turned, and very properly applied to you; for there never was so good a poet, as you are a bad patron. Unless that Stupidity, that you complain your advocate is "immerfed over head and ears in," has blinded the eyes of your own understanding too, I will make ye now sensible that you are become a very Brute yourself. For now you come and confess that "the kings of all nations have laws prescribed to them." But then you say again, "They are not so under the power of them, as to be liable to censure or punishment of death, if they break them." Which yet you have proved neither from scripture, nor from any good author. Observe then in short; to prescribe municipal laws to such as are not bound by them, is silly and ridiculous: and to punish all others, but leave some one man at liberty to commit all sort of impieties without fear of punishment, is most unjust; the law being general, and not making any exception; neither of which can be supposed to hold place in the constitutions of any wise law-maker, much less in those of God's own making. But that all may perceive how unable you are to prove out of the writings of the Jews, what you undertook in this chapter to make appear by them, you confess of your own accord, That "there are some rabbins, who affirm that their forefathers ought not to have had any other king than God himself; and that he set other kings over them for their punishment." And of those mens opinion, I declare myself to be. It is not fitting nor decent that any man should be a king that does not far excel all his subjects. But where men are equals, as in all governments very many are, they ought to have an equal interest in the government, and hold it by turns. But that all men should be slaves to one that is their equal, or (as it happens most commonly) far inferior to them, and very often a fool, who can so much as entertain such a thought without indignation? Nor does "it make for the honour of a kingly government, that our Saviour was of the posterity of some kings," more than it does for the commendation of the worst of kings, that he was the off-spring of some of them too. "The Messias is a king." We acknowledge him so to be, and rejoice that he is so; and pray that his kingdom may come, for he is worthy: Nor is there any other equal, or next to him. And yet a kingly government being put into the hands of unworthy and undeserving persons, as most commonly it is, may well be thought to have done more harm than good to mankind. Nor does it follow for all this that all kings, as such, are tyrants. But suppose it did, as for argument-sake I will allow it does, lest you should think I am too hard with ye; make you the best use of it you can. "Then, say you, God himself may properly be said to be the king of tyrants, nay, himself the worst of all tyrants." If the first of these conclusions does not follow, another does, which may be drawn from most parts of your book, viz. That you perpetually contradict, not only the scriptures, but your own self. For in the very last foregoing period you had affirmed, that "God was the king of all things, having himself created them. Now he created tyrants and devils, and consequently by your own reason, is the king of such. The second of these conclusions we detest, and wish that blasphemous mouth of yours were stopt up, with which you affirm God to be the worst of tyrants, if he be, as you often say he is, the king and lord of such. Nor do you much advantage your cause by telling us that "Moses was a king, and had the absolute and supreme power of a king." For we could be content that any other were so, that could "refer our matters to God, as Moses did, and consult with him about our affairs, Exod. xviii. 19. But neither did Moses, notwithstanding his great familiarity with God, ever assume a liberty of doing what he would himself. What says he of himself; "the people come unto me to enquire of God." They came not then to receive Moses's own dictates and commands. Then says Jethro, ver. 19. "Be thou for the people to Godward, that thou mayst bring their causes unto God." And Moses himself says, Deut. iv. 5. "I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me." Hence it is that he is said to have been "faithful in all the house of God." Numb. xii. 7. So that the Lord Jehovah himself
was

was the people's king, and Moses no other than as it were an interpreter or a messenger betwixt him and them. Nor can you, without impiety and sacrilege, transfer this absolute supreme power and authority from God to a man; (not having any warrant from the word of God so to do) which Moses used only as a deputy or substitute to God; under whose eye, and in whose presence, himself and the people always were. But now, for an aggravation of your wickedness, though here you make Moses to have exercised an absolute and unlimited power, in your "Apparat. ad Primat. page 230." you say that "he, together with the seventy elders, ruled the people, and that himself was the chief of the people, but not their master." If Moses therefore were a king, as certainly he was, and the best of kings, and had a supreme and legal power, as you say he had, and yet neither was the people's master nor governed them alone; then, according to you, kings, though indued with the supreme power, are not by virtue of that sovereign and kingly right of theirs lords over the people, nor ought to govern them alone; much less, according to their own will and pleasure. After all this, you have the impudence to feign a command from God to that people, "to set up a king over them, as soon as they should be possessed of the Holy land," Deut xvii. For you craftily leave out the former words, "and shalt say, I will set a king over me," &c. And now call to mind what you said before, page 42. and what I said I should have occasion to make use of, viz. "That the power was then in the people, and that they were entirely free." What follows, argues you either mad or irreligious; take whether you list: "God," say you, "having so long before appointed a kingly government, as best and most proper for that people; What shall we say to Samuel's opposing it, and God's own acting, as if himself were against it? How do these things agree?" He finds himself caught, and observe now with how great malice against the prophet, and impiety against God, he endeavours to disentangle himself. "We must consider," says he, "that Samuel's own sons then judged the people, and the people rejected them because of their corruption; now Samuel was loth his sons should be laid aside, and God to gratify the prophet, intimated to him, as if himself were not very well pleased with it." Speak out, ye wretch, and never mince the matter: you mean, God dealt deceitfully with Samuel, and he with the people. It is not your advocate, but yourself that are "frantic and distracted;" who cast off all reverence to God Almighty, so you may but seem to honour the king. Would Samuel prefer the interest of his sons and their ambition, and their covetousness, before the general good of all the people, when they asked a thing that would be good and profitable for them? Can we think that he would impose upon them by cunning and subtilty, and make them believe things that were not? Or if we should suppose all this true of Samuel, would God himself countenance and gratify him in it; would he dissemble with the people? So that either that was not the right of kings which Samuel taught the people; or else that right by the testimony, both of God and the prophet, was an evil thing, was burdensome, injurious, unprofitable, and chargeable to the commonwealth: Or Lastly, (which must not be admitted) God and the prophet deceived the people. God frequently protests that he was extremely displeased with them for asking a king. V. 7th. "They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them." As if it were a kind of Idolatry to ask a king, that would even suffer himself to be adored, and assume almost divine honour to himself. And certainly, they that subject themselves to a worldly master, and set him above all laws, come but a little short of chusing a strange God: and a strange one it commonly is; brutish, and void of all sense and reason. So 1st of Sam. chap. 10th. v. 19th. "And ye have this day rejected your God, who himself saved you out of all your adversities and your tribulation, and ye have said unto him, nay, but set a king over us, &c." and chap. 12th, v. 12th. "Ye said unto me, nay, but a king shall reign over us; when the Lord your God was your king: and v. the 17th. "See that your wickedness is great, that ye have done in the sight of the Lord, in asking you a king. And Hosea

speaks contemptibly of the king, chap. xiii. v. 10, 11. I will be thy king; where is any other that may save in all thy cities, and thy judges of whom thou saidst, give me a king and princes? I gave thee a king in mine anger, and took him away in my wrath." And Gideon, that warlike judge, that was greater than a king; "I will not rule over you," says he, "neither shall my son rule over you; the Lord shall rule over you," Judges, chap. viii. Intimating thereby, that it is not fit for a man, but for God only to exercise dominion over men. And hence Josephus in his book against Appion, an Egyptian Grammarian, and a foul-mouthed fellow, like you, calls the commonwealth of the Hebrews a Theocracy, because the principality was in God only. In Isaiah, chap. xxvi. v. 13. the people in their repentance, complain that it had been mischievous to them, "that other lords besides God himself, had had dominion over them." All which places prove clearly, that God gave the Israelites a king in his anger; but now who can forbear laughing at the use you make of Abimelech's story? Of whom it is said, when he was killed, partly by a woman that hurled a piece of a mill-stone upon him, and partly by his own armour-bearer, that "God rendred the wickedness of Abimelech. This history," say you, "proves strongly that God only is the judge and avenger of kings." Yea, if this argument hold, he is the only judge and punisher of tyrants, villainous rascals, and bastards. Whoever can get into the saddle, whether by right or by wrong, has thereby obtained a sovereign kingly right over the people, is out of all danger of punishment, all inferior magistrates must lay down their arms at his feet, the people must not dare to mutter. But what if some great notorious robber had perished in war, as Abimelech did, would any man infer from thence, that God only is the judge and punisher of highway men? Or what if Abimelech had been condemned by the law, and died by an executioner's hand, would not God then have rendred his wickedness? You never read that the judges of the children of Israel were ever proceeded against according to law: And yet you confess, that "where the government is an aristocracy, the prince, if there be any, may and ought to be called in question, if he break the laws." This in your 47th page. And why may not a tyrant as well be proceeded against in a kingly government? why, because God rendered the wickedness of Abimelech. So did the women, and so did his own armour-bearer; over both which he pretended to a right of sovereignty. And what if the magistrates had rendred his wickedness? Do not they bear the sword for that very purpose, for the punishment of malefactors? Having done with his powerful argument from the history of Abimelech's death, he betakes himself, as his custom is, to slanders and calumnies; nothing but dirt and filth comes from him: but for those things that he promised to make appear, he hath not proved any one of them, either from the scriptures, or from the writings of the Rabbins. He alledges no reason why kings should be above all laws, and they only of all mortal men exempt from punishment, if they deserve it. He falls foul upon those very authors and authorities that he makes use of, and by his own discourse demonstrates the truth of the opinion that he argues against. And perceiving that he is like to do but little good with his arguments, he endeavours to bring an Odium upon us, by loading us with slanderous accusations, as having put to death the most virtuous innocent prince that ever reigned. "Was king Solomon, says he, better than king Charles the First?" I confess some have ventured to compare his father king James with Solomon; nay, to make king James the better gentleman of the two. Solomon was David's son, David had been Saul's musician; but king James was the son of the earl of Darnly, who, as Buchanan tells us, because David the musician got into the queen's bed-chamber at an unreasonable time, killed him a little after; for he could not get to him then, because he had bolted the door on the inside. So that king James being the son of an earl, was the better gentleman; and was frequently called a second Solomon, though it is not very certain that himself was not the son of David the musician too. But how could it ever come into your head to make a comparison between king Charles and Solomon? For
that

very king Charles whom you praise thus to the sky, that very man's obstinacy, and covetousness, and cruelty, his hard usage of all good and honest men, the wars that he raised, the spoilings and plunderings and conflagrations that he occasioned, and the death of innumerable of his subjects that he was the cause of, does his son Charles, at this very time whilst I am a writing, confess and bewail on the stool of repentance in Scotland, and renounces there that kingly right that you assert. But since you delight in parallels, let's compare king Charles and king Solomon together a little: "Solomon began his reign with the death of his brother," who had justly deserved it; king Charles began his with his father's funeral, I do not say with his murder: and yet all the marks and tokens of poison that may be, appeared in his dead body; but that suspicion lighted upon the duke of Buckingham only, whom the king notwithstanding cleared to the parliament, though he had killed the king and his father; and not only so, but he dissolved the parliament, lest the matter should be enquired into. "Solomon oppressed the people with heavy taxes;" but he spent that money upon the temple of God, and in raising other public buildings: King Charles spent his in extravagances. Solomon was enticed to idolatry by many wives: This man by one. Solomon, though he were seduced himself, we read not that he seduced others; but king Charles seduced and enticed others not only by large and ample rewards to corrupt the church, but by his edicts and ecclesiastical constitutions he compelled them to set up altars, which all protestants abhor, and to bow down to crucifixes painted over them on the wall. "But yet for all this, Solomon was not condemned to die." Nor does it follow, because he was not, that therefore he ought not to have been. Perhaps there were many circumstances that made it then not expedient. But not long after the people both by words and actions made appear what they took to be their right, when ten tribes of twelve revolted from his son; and if he had not saved himself by flight, it is very likely they would have stoned him, notwithstanding his threats and big swelling words.

C H A P. III.

HAVING proved sufficiently that the kings of the Jews were subject to the same laws that the people were; that there are no exceptions made in their favour in scripture; that it is a most false assertion grounded upon no reason, nor warranted by any authority, to say, that kings may do what they list with impunity; that God has exempted them from all human jurisdiction, and reserved them to his own tribunal only: Let us now consider, whether the gospel preach up any such doctrine, and enjoin that blind obedience which the law was so far from doing, that it commanded the contrary; let us consider, whether or no the gospel, that heavenly promulgation, as it were, of christian liberty, reduce us to a condition of slavery to kings and tyrants, from whose imperious rule even the old law, that mistress of slavery, discharged the people of God, when it obtained. Your first argument you take from the person of Christ himself. But, alas! who does not know that he put himself into the condition, not of a private person only, but even of a servant, that we might be made free? Nor is this to be understood of some internal spiritual liberty only; how inconsistent else would that song of his mother's be with the design of his coming into the world, "He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their heart, he hath put down the mighty from their seat, and hath exalted the humble and meek?" How ill suited to their occasion would these expressions be, if the coming of Christ rather established and strengthened a tyrannical government, and made a blind subjection the duty of all christians? He himself having been born, and lived and died under a tyrannical government, has thereby purchased liberty for us. As he gives us his grace to submit patiently to a condition of slavery, if there be a necessity of it; so if by any honest ways and means we can rid ourselves,
and

and obtain our liberty, he is so far from restraining us, that he encourages us so to do. Hence it is that St. Paul not only of an evangelical, but also of a civil liberty, says thus, 1 Cor. vii. 21. "Art thou called, being a servant? care not for it; but if thou mayst be made free, use it rather; you are bought with a price, be not ye servants of men." So that you are very impertinent in endeavouring to argue us into slavery by the example of our Saviour; who by submitting to such a condition himself, has confirmed even our civil liberties. He took upon him indeed in our stead the form of a servant, but he always retained his purpose of being a deliverer; and thence it was that he taught us a quite other notion of the right of kings, than this that you endeavour to make good. You, I say, that preach up not kingship, but tyranny, and that in a commonwealth; by enjoining not only a necessary, but a religious subjection to whatever tyrant gets into the chair, whether he come to it by succession, or by conquest, or chance, or any how. And now I will turn your own weapons against you; and oppose you, as I use to do, with your own authorities. When the collectors of the tribute money came to Christ for tribute in Galilee, he asked Peter, Mat. 17. "Of whom the kings of the earth took custom or tribute, of their own children, or of strangers?" Peter saith unto him, "of strangers;" Jesus saith unto him, "then are the children free; notwithstanding lest we should offend them, &c. give unto them for thee and for me." Expositors differ upon this place, whom this tribute was paid to; some say it was paid to the priests, for the use of the sanctuary; others that it was paid to the emperor. I am of opinion that it was the revenue of the sanctuary, but paid to Herod, who perverted the institution of it, and took it to himself. Josephus mentions divers sorts of tribute which he and his sons exacted, all which Agrippa afterwards remitted. And this very tribute, though small in itself, yet being accompanied with many more, was a heavy burden. The Jews, even the poorest of them in the time of their commonwealth, paid a poll; so that it was some considerable oppression that our Saviour spoke of: and from hence he took occasion to tax Herod's injustice (under whose government, and within whose jurisdiction he then was) in that, whereas the kings of the earth, who affect usually the title of fathers of their country, do not use to oppress their own children, that is, their own natural-born subjects with heavy and unreasonable exactions, but lay such burdens upon strangers, and conquered enemies; he, quite contrary, oppressed not strangers, but his own people. But let what will be here meant by children, either natural-born subjects, or the children of God, and those of the elect only, or christians in general, as St. Augustine understands the place; this is certain, that if Peter was a child, and therefore free, then by consequence we are so too, by our Saviour's own testimony, either as Englishmen, or as christians, and that it therefore is not the right of kings to exact heavy tributes from their own countrymen, and those free-born subjects. Christ himself professes, that he paid not this tribute as a thing that was due, but that he might not bring trouble upon himself by offending those that demanded it. The work that he came into this world to do, was quite of another nature. But if our Saviour deny, that it is the right of kings to burden their free-born subjects with grievous exactions; he would certainly much less allow it to be their right to spoil, massacre, and torture their own countrymen, and those christians too. He discoursed after such a manner of the right of kings, that those to whom he spoke, suspected his principles, as laying too great a restraint upon sovereignty, and not allowing the licence that tyrants assume to themselves to be the rights of kings. It was not for nothing that the Pharisees put such questions to him, tempting him; and that at the same time they told him, that he regarded not the person of any man: nor was it for nothing that he was angry when such questions were proposed to him, Matth. xxii. If one should endeavour to ensnare you with little questions, and catch at your answers, to ground an accusation against you upon your own principles concerning the right of kings, and all this under a monarchy, would you be angry with him? You would have but very little reason. It is evident,

vident, that our Saviour's principles concerning government, were not agreeable to the humour of princes. His answer too implies as much; by which he rather turned them away, than instructed them. He asked for the tribute-money. "Whose image and superscription is it", says he? They tell him it was Cæsar's. "Give then to Cæsar," says he, "the things that are Cæsar's; and to God, the things that are God's. And how comes it to pass, that the people should not have given to them the things that are theirs? "Render to all men their dues," says St. Paul, Rom. xiii. So that Cæsar must not ingross all to himself. Our liberty is not Cæsar's; it is a blessing we have received from God himself; it is what we are born to; to lay this down at Cæsar's feet, which we derive not from him, which we are not beholden to him for, were an unworthy action, and a degrading of our very nature. If one should consider attentively the countenance of a man, and enquire after whose image so noble a creature were framed; would not any one that heard him, presently make answer, That he was made after the image of God himself? Being therefore peculiarly God's own, and consequently things that are to be given to him; we are intirely free by nature, and cannot without the greatest sacrilege imaginable be reduced into a condition of slavery to any man, especially to a wicked, unjust, cruel tyrant. Our Saviour does not take upon him to determine what things are God's, and what Cæsar's; he leaves that as he found it. If the piece of money which they shewed him, was the same that was paid to God, as in Vespasian's time it was; then our Saviour is so far from having put an end to the controversy, that he has but entangled it, and made it more perplexed than it was before: for it is impossible the same thing should be given both to God, and to Cæsar. But, you say, he intimates to them what things were Cæsar's; to wit, that piece of money, because it bore the emperor's stamp; and what of all that? How does this advantage your cause? You get not the emperor, or yourself a penny by this conclusion. Either Christ allowed nothing at all to be Cæsar's, but that piece of money that he then had in his hand, and thereby asserted the people's interest in every thing else; or else, if (as you would have us understand him) he affirms all money that has the emperor's stamp upon it, to be the emperor's own, he contradicts himself, and indeed gives the magistrate a property in every man's estate, whenas he himself paid his tribute-money with a protestation, that it was more than what either Peter, or he were bound to do. The ground you rely on, is very weak; for money bears the prince's image, not as a token of its being his, but of its being good metal, and that none may presume to counterfeit it. If the writing princes names, or setting their stamps upon a thing, vest the property of it in them, it were a good ready way for them to invade all property. Or rather, if whatever subjects have, be absolutely at their princes disposal, which is your assertion, that piece of money was not Cæsar's, because his image was stamp'd on it, but because of right it belonged to him before it was coined. So that nothing can be more manifest, than that our Saviour in this place never intended to teach us our duty to magistrates (he would have spoke more plainly, if he had) but to reprehend the malice and wickedness of the hypocritical Pharisees. When they told him that Herod laid wait to kill him; did he return an humble, submissive answer? "Go, tell that fox," says he, &c. intimating, that kings have no other right to destroy their subjects, than foxes have to devour the things they prey upon. Say you, 'he suffered death under a tyrant.' How could he possibly under any other? But from hence you conclude, that he asserted it to be the right of kings to commit murder, and act injustice. You would make an excellent moralist. But our Saviour, though he became a servant, not to make us so, but that we might be free; yet carried he himself so with relation to the magistracy, as not to ascribe any more to them than their due. Now, let us come at last to enquire what his doctrine was upon this subject. The sons of Zebedee were ambitious of honour and power in the kingdom of Christ, which they persuaded themselves he would shortly set up in the world; he reproves them so, as withal to let all christians know what form of civil government he desires they should settle

amongst themselves. "Ye know," says he, "that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them; and they that are great, exercise authority upon them: but it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." Unless you had been distracted, you could never have imagined that this place makes for you: and yet you urge it, and think it furnishes you with an argument to prove that our kings are absolute lords and masters over us and ours. May it be our fortune to have to do with such enemies in war, as will fall blindfold and naked into our camp instead of their own: as you constantly do, who alledge that for yourself, that of all things in the world makes most against you. The Israelites asked God for a king, such a king as other nations round about them had. God dissuaded them by many arguments, whereof our Saviour here gives us an epitome; "You know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them." But yet, because the Israelites persisted in their desire of a king, God gave them one, though in his wrath. Our Saviour, lest Christians should desire a king, such a one at least as might rule, as he says the princes of the Gentiles did, prevents them with an injunction to the contrary; "but it shall not be so among you." What can be said plainer than this? That stately, imperious sway and dominion that kings use to exercise, shall not be amongst you; what specious titles soever they may assume to themselves, as that of benefactors; or the like. "But he that will be great amongst you" (and who is greater than the prince?) "let him be your servant." So that the lawyer, whoever he be, that you are so smart upon, was not so much out of the way, but had our Saviour's own authority to back him, when he said that christian princes were indeed no other than the people's servants; it is very certain that all good magistrates are so. Inasmuch that christians either must have no king at all, or if they have, that king must be the people's servant. Absolute lordship and christianity are inconsistent. Moses himself, by whose ministry that servile Oeconomy of the old law was instituted, did not exercise an arbitrary, haughty power and authority, but bore the burden of the people, and carried them in his bosom, as a nursing father does a sucking child, Numb. xi. and what is that of a nursing father but a ministerial employment? Plato would not have the magistrates called lords, but servants and helpers of the people; nor the people servants, but maintainers of their magistrates, because they give meat, drink and wages to their kings themselves. Aristotle calls the magistrates, keepers and ministers of the laws. Plato, ministers and servants. The apostle calls them ministers of God; but they are ministers and servants of the people, and of the laws, nevertheless for all that; the laws and the magistrates were both created for the good of the people: And yet this is it, that you call "the opinion of the fanatic mastiffs in England." I should not have thought the people of England were mastiff-dogs, if such a mungrel-cur as thou art, did not bark at them so currishly. The master, if it shall please ye, of St. Lupus*, complains it seems that the mastiffs are mad (Fanatics.) Germanus heretofore, whose colleague that Lupus of Triers was, deposed our incestuous king Vortigern by his own authority. And therefore St. Lupus despises thee, the master not of a Holy Wolf, but of some hunger-starved thieving little wolf or other, as being more contemptible than that master of vipers, of whom Martial makes mention, who hast by relation a barking she-wolf at home too, that domineers over thee most wretchedly; at whose instigations, as I am informed, thou hast wrote this stuff. And therefore it is the less wonder that thou shouldest endeavour to obtrude an absolute regal government upon others, who hast been accustomed to bear a female rule so servilely at home thyself. Be therefore, in the name of God, the master of a wolf, lest a she-wolf be thy mistress; be a wolf thyself, be a monster made up of a man, and a wolf; whatever thou art, the English mastiffs will but make a laughing-stock of thee. But I am

* Lupus in Latin signifies a wolf.

not now at leisure to hunt for wolves, and will put an end therefore to this digression. You that but a while ago wrote a book against all manner of superiority in the church, now call St. Peter the prince of the apostles. How inconstant you are in your principles! But what says Peter? "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme, or to governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and the praise of them that do well: for so is the will of God, &c. This epistle Peter wrote, not only to private persons, but those strangers scattered and dispersed through Asia; who in those places where they sojourned, had no other right, than what the laws of hospitality intitled them to. Do you think such mens case to be the same with that of natives, free-born subjects, nobility, senates, assemblies of estates, parliaments? nay, is not the case far different of private persons, though in their own country; and senators, or magistrates, without whom kings themselves cannot possibly subsist? But let us suppose that St. Peter had directed his epistle to the natural-born subjects, and those not private persons neither; suppose he had writ to the senate of Rome; what then? No law that is grounded upon a reason, expressly set down in the law itself, obligeth further than the reason of it extends. "Be subject," says he, *ὁποσάκις*: That is, according to the genuine sense and import of the word, "be subordinate, or legally subject. For the law, Aristotle says, is order. "Submit for the Lord's sake." Why so? Because a king is an officer "appointed by God for the punishment of evil-doers, and the praise of them that do well; for so is the will of God:" To wit, that we should submit and yield obedience to such as are here described. There is not a word spoken of any other. You see the ground of this precept, and how well it is laid. The apostle adds in the 16th verse, as Free; therefore not as Slaves. What now? if princes pervert the design of magistracy, and use the power, that is put into their hands, to the ruin and destruction of good men, and the praise and encouragement of evil-doers; must we all be condemned to perpetual slavery, not private persons only, but our nobility, all our inferior magistrates, our very parliament itself? Is not temporal government called a human ordinance? How comes it to pass then, that mankind should have power to appoint and constitute, what may be good and profitable for one another; and want power to restrain or suppress things that are universally mischievous and destructive? That prince, you say, to whom St. Peter enjoins subjection, was Nero the tyrant: And from thence you infer, that it is our duty to submit and yield obedience to such. But it is not certain that this epistle was writ in Nero's reign: It is as likely to have been writ in Claudius's time. And they that are commanded to submit, were private persons and strangers; they were no consuls, no magistrates: It was not the Roman Senate, that St. Peter directed his epistle to. Now let us hear what use you make of St. Paul (for you take a freedom with the apostles, I find, that you will not allow us to take with princes; you make St. Peter the chief of them to-day, and to-morrow put another in his place) St. Paul in his 13th chap. to the Romans, has these words: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers, for there is no power but of God; the powers that be, are ordained of God." I confess he writes this to the Romans, not to strangers dispersed, as Peter did; but however he writes to private persons, and those of the meaner rank: And yet he gives us a true, and a clear account of the reason, the original, and the design of government; and shows us the true and proper ground of our obedience, that it is far from imposing a necessity upon us of being slaves. "Let every soul, says he; that is, let every man submit." Chrysostom tells us, "that St. Paul's design in this discourse, was to make it appear, that our Saviour did not go about to introduce principles inconsistent with the civil government, but such as strengthened it, and settled it upon the surest foundations." He never intended then by setting Nero, or any other tyrant out of the reach of all laws, to enslave mankind under his lust and cruelty. "He intended too, says the same author, to dissuade from unnecessary and causeless wars." But he does not condemn a war taken up against a tyrant, a

bosom enemy of his own country, and consequently the most dangerous that may be. "It was commonly said in those days, that the doctrine of the Apostles was seditious, themselves persons that endeavoured to shake the settled laws and government of the world; that this was what they aimed at in all they said and did." The Apostle in this chapter stops the mouths of such gainsayers: So that the Apostles did not write in defence of tyrants, as you do; but they asserted such things as made them suspected to be enemies to the government they lived under, things that stood in need of being explained and interpreted, and having another sense put upon them than was generally received. St. Chrysostom has now taught us what the Apostle's design was in this discourse; let us now examine his words: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." He tells us not what those higher powers are, nor who they are; for he never intended to overthrow all governments, and the several constitutions of nations, and subject all to some one man's will. Every good emperor acknowledged that the laws of the empire, and the authority of the senate was above himself: and the same principle and notion of government has obtained all along in civilized nations. Pindar, as he is cited by Herodotus, calls the law *πάντων βασιλεία*, king over all. Orpheus in his hymns calls it the king both of Gods and men: And he gives the reason why it is so; because, says he, it is that that sits at the helm of all human affairs. Plato in his book *De Legibus*, calls it *τὸ κρατὺν ἐν τῇ πόλει*: that that ought to have the greatest sway in the commonwealth. In his epistles he commends that form of government, in which the law is made lord and master, and no scope given to any man to tyrannize over the laws. Aristotle is of the same opinion in his *Politics*; and so is Cicero in his book *de Legibus*, that the laws ought to govern the magistrates as they do the people. The law therefore having always been accounted the highest power on earth, by the judgment of the most learned and wise men that ever were, and by the constitutions of the best-ordered states; and it being very certain that the doctrine of the gospel is neither contrary to reason nor the law of nations, that man is truly and properly subject to the higher powers who obeys the law and the magistrates, so far as they govern according to law. So that St. Paul does not only command the people, but princes themselves to be in subjection; who are not above the laws, but bound by them, "for there is no power but of God:" that is no form, no lawful constitution of any government. The most ancient laws that are known to us, were formerly ascribed to God as their author. For the law, says Cicero in his *Philippics*, is no other than a rule of well-grounded reason, derived from God himself, enjoining whatever is just and right, and forbidding the contrary. So that the institution of magistracy is *Jure Divino*, and the end of it is, that mankind might live under certain laws, and be governed by them. But what particular form of government each nation would live under, and what persons should be entrusted with the magistracy, without doubt, was left to the choice of each nation. Hence St. Peter calls kings and deputies, human ordinances. And Hosea in the 8th chapter of his prophecy, "they have set up kings, but not by me; they have made princes, and I knew it not." For in the commonwealth of the Hebrews, where, upon matters of great and weighty importance, they could have access to God himself, and consult with him, they could not chuse a king themselves by law, but were to refer the matter to him. Other nations have received no such command. Sometimes the very form of government, if it be amiss, or at least those persons that have the power in their hands, are not of God, but of men, or of the devil, Luke iv. "All this power will I give unto thee, for it is delivered unto me, and I give it to whom I will." Hence the devil is called the prince of this world; and in the 12th of the Revelations, the dragon gave to the beast his power, and his throne, and great authority. So that we must not understand St. Paul, as if he spoke of all sorts of magistrates in general, but of lawful magistrates; and so they are described in what follows. We must also understand him of the powers themselves; not of those men always, in whose hands they are lodged. St. Chrysostom speaks very well, and clearly upon this occasion. "What?" says he, "is every

every prince then appointed by God to be so? I say no such thing," says he. "St. Paul speaks not of the person of the magistrate, but of the magistracy itself. He does not say, there is no prince but who is of God. He says there is no power but of God." Thus far St. Chrysostom; for what powers are, are ordained of God: So that Paul speaks only of a lawful magistracy. For what is evil and amiss, cannot be said to be ordained, because it is disorderly; order and disorder cannot consist together in the same subject. The Apostle says, "the powers that be;" and you interpret his words as if he had said, "the powers that now be;" that you may prove that the Romans ought in conscience to obey Nero, who you take for granted was then emperor. I am very well content you should read the words so, and draw that conclusion from them. The consequence will be, that Englishmen ought to yield obedience to the present government, as it is now established according to a new model; because you must needs acknowledge that it is the present government, and ordained of God, as much at least as Nero's was. And lest you should object that Nero came to the empire by a lawful succession, it is apparent from the Roman history that both he and Tiberius got into the chair by the tricks and artifices of their mothers, and had no right at all to the succession. So that you are inconsistent with your self, and retract from your own principles, in affirming that the Romans owed subjection to the government that then was; and yet denying that Englishmen owe subjection to the government that now is. But it is no wonder to hear you contradict yourself. There are no two things in the world more directly opposite and contrary to one another, than you are to your self. But what will become of you, poor wretch? You have quite undone the young king with your witticisms, and ruined his fortunes utterly; for according to your own doctrine you must needs confess, that this present government in England, is ordained of God, and that all Englishmen are bound in conscience to submit to it. Take notice, all ye critics and textuaries; do not you presume to meddle with this text. Thus Salmasius corrects that passage in the epistle to the Romans: He has made a discovery, that the words ought not to be read, "the powers that are; but, the powers that now are:" And all this to prove that all men owed subjection and obedience to Nero the tyrant, whom he supposed to have been then emperor. This Epistle, which you say was writ in Nero's time, was writ in his predecessor's time, who was an honest well-meaning man: And this learned men evince by undeniable arguments. But besides, the five first years of Nero's reign were without exception. So that this threadbare argument, which so many men have at their tongues end, and have been deceived by, to wit, that tyrants are to be obeyed, because St. Paul enjoins a subjection to Nero, is evident to have been but a cunning invention of some ignorant parson. He that resists the powers, to wit, a lawful power, resists the ordinance of God. Kings themselves come under the penalty of this law, when they resist the senate, and act contrary to the laws. But do they resist the ordinance of God, that resist an unlawful power, or a person that goes about to overthrow and destroy a lawful one? No man living in his right wits can maintain such an assertion. The words immediately after make it as clear as the sun, that the apostle speaks only of a lawful power; for he gives us in them a definition of magistrates, and thereby explains to us who are the persons thus authorized, and upon what account we are to yield obedience, lest we should be apt to mistake and ground extravagant notions upon his discourse. "The magistrates," says he, "are not a terror to good works, but to evil: Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. He beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil." What honest man would not willingly submit to such a magistracy as is here described? And that not only to avoid wrath, and for fear of punishment, but for conscience sake. Without magistrates, and some form or other of civil government, no commonwealth, no human society can subsist, there were no living in the world. But whatever power enables a man, or whatsoever magistrate takes upon him to act contrary to what St. Paul makes the duty of those that are in authority; neither

neither is that power, nor that magistrate ordained of God. And consequently to such a magistracy no subjection is commanded, nor is any due, nor are the people forbidden to resist such authority; for in so doing they do not resist the power, nor the magistracy, as they are here excellently well described; but they resist a robber, a tyrant, an enemy; who if he may notwithstanding in some sense be called a magistrate, upon this account only, because he has power in his hands, which perhaps God may have invested him with for our punishment; by the same reason the devil may be called a magistrate. This is most certain, that there can be but one true definition of one and the same thing. So that if St. Paul in this place define what a magistrate is, which he certainly does, and that accurately well; he cannot possibly define a Tyrant, the most contrary thing imaginable, in the same words. Hence I infer, that he commands us to submit to such magistrates only as he himself defines and describes, and not to Tyrants, which are quite other things. "For this cause you pay tribute also:" He gives a reason, together with a command. Hence St. Chrysostom; "why do we pay tribute to princes? Do we not," adds he, "thereby reward them for the care they take of our safety? We should not have paid them any tribute if we had not been convinced, that it was good for us to live under a government." So that I must here repeat what I have said already, that since subjection is not absolutely enjoined, but on a particular reason, that reason must be the rule of our subjection: where that reason holds, we are rebels if we submit not; where it holds not, we are cowards and slaves if we do. "But," say you, "the English are far from being freemen; for they are wicked and flagitious." I will not reckon up here the vices of the French, tho' they live under a kingly government; neither will I excuse my own countrymen too far: but this I may safely say, whatever vices they have, they have learnt them under a kingly government; as the Israelites learnt a great deal of wickedness in Egypt. And as they, when they were brought into the wilderness, and lived under the immediate government of God himself, could hardly reform, just so it is with us. But there are good hopes of many amongst us; that I may not here celebrate those men who are eminent for their piety and virtue, and love of the truth; of which sort I persuade myself we have as great a number, as where you think there are most such. "But they have laid a heavy yoke upon the English nation:" What if they have, upon those of them that endeavoured to lay a heavy yoke upon all the rest? Upon those that have deserved to be put under the hatches? As for the rest, I question not but they are very well content to be at the expence of maintaining their own liberty, the public treasury being exhausted by the civil wars. Now he betakes himself to the fabulous Rabbins again: He asserts frequently, that kings are bound by no laws; and yet he proves, that according to the sense of the Rabbins, "a king may be guilty of treason, by suffering an invasion upon the rights of his crown." So kings are bound by laws, and they are not bound by them; they may be criminals, and yet they may not be so. This man contradicts himself so perpetually, that contradiction and he seem to be of kin to one another. You say that God himself put many kingdoms under the yoke of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. I confess he did so for a time, Jer. xxvii. 7. but do you make appear, if you can, that he put the English nation into a condition of slavery to Charles Stuart for a minute. I confess he suffered them to be enslaved by him for some time; but I never yet heard that himself appointed it so to be. Or if you will have it so, that God shall be said to put a nation under slavery, when a tyrant prevails; why may he not as well be said to deliver them from his tyranny, when the people prevail and get the upper hand? Shall his tyranny be said to be of God, and not our liberty? There is no evil in the city, that the Lord hath not done, Amos iii. So that famine, pestilence, sedition, war, all of them are of God; and is it therefore unlawful for a people afflicted with any of these plagues, to endeavour to get rid of them? Certainly they would do their utmost, tho' they know them to be sent by God, unless himself miraculously from heaven should command the contrary: And why may they not by the same reason rid themselves of a tyrant,

tyrant, if they are stronger than he? Why should we suppose his weakness to be appointed by God for the ruin and destruction of the commonwealth, rather than the power and strength of all the people for the good of the state? Far be it from all commonwealths, from all societies of free-born men, to maintain not only such pernicious, but such stupid and senseless principles; principles that subvert all civil society, that to gratify a few tyrants, level all mankind with brutes; and by setting princes out of the reach of human laws, give them an equal power over both. I pass by those foolish Dilemma's that you now make, which that you might take occasion to propose, you feign some or other to assert that the "superlative power of princes is derived from the people;" though for my own part I do not at all doubt but that all the power that any magistrates have, is so. Hence Cicero, in his *Orat. pro Flacco*, 'Our wise and holy ancestors, says he, appointed those things to obtain for laws, that the people enacted.' And hence it is that Lucius Crassus, an excellent Roman Orator, and at that time president of the senate, when in a controversy betwixt them and the common people, he asserted their rights, 'I beseech you, says he, suffer not us to live in subjection to any, but your selves, to the entire body of whom we can and ought to submit.' For though the Roman senate governed the people, the people themselves had appointed them to be their governors, and had put that power into their hands. We read the term of Majesty more frequently applied to the people of Rome, than to their kings. Tully in *Orat. pro Flancio*, 'it is the condition of all free people, (says he) and especially of this people, the lord of all nations, by their votes to give or take away, to or from any, as themselves see cause. It is the duty of the magistrates patiently to submit to what the body of the people enact. Those that are not ambitious of honour, have the less obligation upon them to court the people: Those that affect preferment, must not be weary of entreating them.' Should I scruple to call a king the servant of his people, when I hear the Roman senate, that reigned over so many kings, profess themselves to be but the people's servants? You'll object perhaps, and say, that all this is very true in a popular state; but the case was altered afterwards, when the regal law transferred all the people's right unto Augustus and his successors. But what think you then of Tiberius, whom yourself confess to have been a very great tyrant, as he certainly was? Suetonius says of him, that when he was once called Lord or Master, though after the enacting of that *Lex Regia*, he desired the person that gave him that appellation, to forbear abusing him. How does this sound in your ears? a tyrant thinks one of his subjects abuses him in calling him Lord. The same emperor in one of his speeches to the senate, 'I have said, says he, frequently, heretofore, and now I say it again, that a good prince, whom you have invested with so great power as I am entrusted with, ought to serve the senate, and the body of the people, and sometimes even particular persons; nor do I repent of having said so: I confess that you have been good, and just, and indulgent masters to me, and that you are yet so.' You may say that he dissimulated in all this, as he was a great proficient in the art of hypocrisy; but that's all one. No man endeavours to appear otherwise than he ought to be. Hence Tacitus tells us, that it was the custom in Rome for the emperors in the Circus, to worship the people; and that both Nero and other emperors practised it. Claudian in his panegyric upon Honorius mentions the same custom. By which sort of adoration what could possibly be meant, but that the emperors of Rome, even after the enacting of the *Lex Regia*, confessed the whole body of the people to be their superiors? But I find, as I suspected at first, and so I told ye, that you have spent more time and pains in turning over glossaries, and criticising upon texts, and propagating such-like laborious trifles, than in reading sound authors so as to improve your knowledge by them. For had you been never so little versed in the writings of learned men in former ages, you would not have accounted an opinion new, and the product of some enthusiastic heads, which has been asserted and maintained by the greatest philosophers, and most famous politicians in the world. You endeavour to expose one Martin, who you tell us was a Taylor, and

one William a Tanner; but if they are such as you describe them, I think they and you may very well go together; though they themselves would be able to instruct you, and unfold those mysterious riddles that you propose: as, "Whether or no they that in a monarchy would have the king but a servant to the commonwealth, will say the same thing of the whole body of the people in a popular state? And whether all the people serve in a democracy, or only some part or other serve the rest?" And when they have been an *Œdipus* to you, by my consent you shall be a *Sphinx* to them in good earnest, and throw yourself headlong from some precipice or other, and break your neck; for else I'm afraid you'll never have done with your riddles and fooleries. You ask, "Whether or no, when St. Paul names kings, he meant the people? I confess St. Paul commands us to pray for kings, but he had commanded us to pray for the people before, ver. 1. But there are some for all that, both among kings and common people, that we are forbidden to pray for; and if a man must not so much as be prayed for, may he not be punished? What should hinder? But, "when Paul wrote this epistle, he that reigned was the most profligate person in the world." That's false. For *Ludovicus Capellus* makes it evident, that this epistle likewise was writ in *Claudius's* time. When St. Paul has occasion to speak of *Nero*, he calls him not a king, but a *Lion*; that is, a wild, savage beast, from whose jaws he is glad he was delivered, 2 *Tim. iv.* So that it is for kings, not for beasts that we are to pray, that under them we may live a quiet and a peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty. Kings and their interest are not the things here intended to be advanced and secured; it is the public peace, godliness and honesty, whose establishment we are commanded to endeavour after, and to pray for. But is there any people in the world that would not chuse rather to live an honest and careful life, tho' never free from war and troubles, in the defence of themselves and their families, whether against tyrants or enemies (for I make no difference) than under the power of a tyrant or an enemy, to spin out a life equally troublesome, accompanied with slavery and ignominy? That the latter is the more desirable of the two, I'll prove by a testimony of your own; not because I think your authority worth quoting, but that all men may observe how double-tongued you are, and how mercenary your pen is. "Who would not rather, say you, bear with those dissensions that through the emulation of great men often happen in an aristocratical government, than live under the tyrannical government of one, where nothing but certain misery and ruin is to be looked for? The people of *Rome* preferred their commonwealth, tho' never so much shattered with civil broils, before the intolerable yoke of their emperors. When a people, to avoid sedition, submits to a monarchy, and finds by experience, that this is the worst evil of the two, they often desire to return to their former government again." These are your own words, and more you have to this purpose in that discourse concerning bishops, which under a feigned name you wrote against *Petavius the Jesuit*; tho' yourself are more a *Jesuit* than he, nay worse than any of that crew. We have already heard the sense of the scripture upon this subject; and it has been worth our while to take some pains to find it out. But perhaps it will not be so to enquire into the judgment of the fathers, and to ransack their volumes: for if they assert any thing which is not warranted by the word of God, we may safely reject their authority, be it never so great; and particularly that expression that you alledge out of *Irenæus*, "that God in his providence orders it so, that such kings reign as are suitable to, and proper for the people they are to govern, all circumstances considered." That expression, I say, is directly contrary to scripture. For though God himself declared openly that it was better for his own people to be governed by judges than by kings, yet he left it to them to change that form of government for a worse, if they would themselves. And we read frequently, that when the body of the people has been good, they have had a wicked king, and contrariwise that a good king has sometimes reigned when the people have been wicked. So that wise and prudent men are to consider and see what is profitable and fit for the people in general; for it is very certain that the same form of government is not equally

convenient for all nations, nor for the same nation at all times; but sometimes one, sometimes another may be more proper, according as the industry and valour of the people may increase or decay. But if you deprive the people of this liberty of setting up what government they like best among themselves, you take that from them, in which the life of all civil liberty consists. Then you tell us of Justin Martyr, of his humble and submissive behaviour to the Antonines, those best of emperors; as if any body would not do the like to princes of such moderation as they were. "How much worse christians are we in these days, than those were? They were content to live under a prince of another religion." Alas! they were private persons, and infinitely inferior to the contrary party in strength and number. "But now papists will not endure a protestant prince, nor protestants one that is popish." You do well and discreetly in shewing yourself to be neither papist nor protestant. And you are very liberal in your concessions; for now you confess that all sorts of christians agree in that very thing, that you alone take upon you with so much impudence and wickedness, to cry down and oppose. And how unlike those fathers that you commend, do you show yourself: They wrote apologies for the christians to heathen princes; you in defence of a wicked popish king, against christians and protestants. Then you entertain us with a number of impertinent quotations out of Athenagoras and Tertullian: Things that we have already heard out of the writings of the apostles, much more clearly and intelligibly expressed. But Tertullian was quite of a different opinion from yours, of a king's being a lord and master over his subjects: Which you either knew not, or wickedly dissembled. For he, though he were a christian, and directed his discourse to a heathen emperor, had the confidence to tell him, that an emperor ought not to be called Lord. "Augustus himself, says he, that formed this empire, refused that appellation: It is a title proper to God only. Not but that the title of lord and master may in some sense be ascribed to the emperor: But there is a peculiar sense of that word, which is proper to God only; and in that sense, I will not ascribe it to the emperor. I am the emperor's free-man. God alone is my Lord and Master." And the same author, in the same discourse; "how inconsistent," says he, "are those two appellations, Father of his country, and Lord and Master?" And now I wish you much joy of Tertullian's authority, whom it had been a great deal better you had let alone. But Tertullian calls them parricides that slew Domitian. And he does well, for so they were, his wife and servants conspired against him. And they set one Parthenius and Stephanus, who were accused for concealing part of the public treasure, to make him away. If the senate and the people of Rome had proceeded against him according to the custom of their ancestors; had given judgment of death against him, as they did once against Nero; and had made search for him to put him to death; do ye think Tertullian would have called them Parricides? If he had, he would have deserved to be hanged, as you do. I give the same answer to your quotation out of Origen, that I have given already to what you have cited out of Irenæus. Athanasius indeed says, that kings are not accountable before human tribunals. But I wonder who told Athanasius this? I do not hear that he produces any authority from Scripture, to confirm this assertion. And I'll rather believe kings and emperors themselves, who deny that they themselves have any such privilege, than I will Athanasius. Then you quote Ambrosius, who after he had been a Proconsul, and after that became a Catechumen, at last got into a bishopric: But for his authority, I say, that his interpretation of those words of David, "against thee only I have sinned," is both ignorant and adulatory. He was willing all others should be enthralled to the emperor, that he might enthrall the emperor to himself. We all know with what a papal pride and arrogance he treated Theodosius the emperor, how he took upon him to declare him guilty of that massacre at Thessalonica, and to forbid him coming into the church; how miserably raw in divinity, and unacquainted with the doctrine of the gospel, he shewed himself upon that occasion; when the emperor fell down at his feet, he commanded him to get him out of the porch. At last, when he

was received again into the communion of the Church, and had offered, because he continued standing near to the altar, the magisterial prelate commanded him out of the rails: "O Emperor," says he, "these inner places are for the priests only, it is not lawful for others to come within them!" Does this sound like the behaviour of a minister of the gospel, or like that of a Jewish high priest? And yet this man, such as we hear he was, would have the emperor ride other people, that himself might ride him, which is a common trick of almost all ecclesiastics. With words to this purpose, he put back the emperor as inferior to himself: "You rule over men," saith he, "that are partakers of the same nature, and fellow-servants with yourself: for there is one only Lord and King over all, to wit, the Creator of all." This is very pretty! This piece of truth, which the craft and flattery of clergymen has all along endeavoured to suppress and obscure, was then brought to light by the furious passion, or to speak more mildly, by the ignorant indiscreet zeal of one of them. After you have displayed Ambrose's ignorance, you show your own, or rather, vent a Heresy in affirming point-blank, That "under the Old Testament, there was no such things as forgiveness of sins upon the account of Christ's sufferings, since David confessed his transgression, saying, Against thee only have I sinned, Ps. lviii. It is the orthodox tenet, that there never was any remission of sins, but by the blood of the Lamb that was slain from the beginning of the world. I know not whose disciple you are, that set up for a broacher of new heresies: but certain I am, that that great divine's disciple whom you are so angry with, did not mistake himself, when he said that any one of David's subjects might have said, "against thee only have I sinned," as properly, and with as much right, as David himself. Then you quote St. Austin, and produce a company of Hipponensian divines: What you alledge out of St. Austin, makes not at all against us. We confess that, as the prophet Daniel has it, it is God that changeth times, sets up one kingdom, and pulls down another; we only desire to have it allowed us, that he makes use of men as his instruments. If God alone gave a kingdom to king Charles, God alone has taken it from him again, and given it to the parliament, and to the people. If therefore our allegiance was due to king Charles, because God had given him a kingdom; for the same reason it is now due to the present magistracy. For yourself confess, that God has given our magistrates such power as he uses to give to wicked princes, for the punishment of the nation. And the consequence of this will be, that according to your own opinion, our present magistrates being raised and appointed by God, cannot lawfully be deposed by any, but God himself. Thus you overthrow the opinion you pretend to maintain, which is a thing very frequent with you: your apology for the king carries its death's-wound in it. You have attained to such a prodigious degree of madness and stupidity, as to prove it unlawful upon any account whatsoever, to lift up one's finger against magistrates, and with the very next breath to affirm that it is the duty of their subjects to rise up in rebellion against them. You tell us that St. Jerom calls Ishmael that slew Gedaliah, a parricide or traitor: and it is very true, that he was so: for Gedaliah was deputy governor of Judæa, a good man, and slain by Ishmael without any cause. The same author in his comment upon the book of Ecclesiastes, says, that Solomon's command to keep the king's commandment, is the same with St. Paul's doctrine, upon the same subject; and deserves commendation for having made a more moderate construction of that text, than most of his contemporaries. You say, you will forbear enquiring into the sentiments of learned men that lived since St. Austin's time: but to shew that you had rather dispense with a lye, than not quote any author that you think makes for you, in the very next period but one, you produce the authorities of Isidore, Gregory, and Otho, Spanish and Dutch authors, that lived in the most barbarous and ignorant ages of all; whose authorities, if you knew how much we despise, you would not have told a lye to have quoted them. But would you know the reason why he dares not come so low as to the present times? why he does as it were hide himself, and disappear, when he comes towards our own times? The reason is, because he knows full well, that as many eminent divines

divines as there are of the reformed churches, so many adversaries he would have to encounter. Let him take up the cudgels, if he thinks fit; he will quickly find himself run down with innumerable authorities out of Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin, Bucer, Martyr, Paræus, and the rest. I could oppose you with testimonies out of divines that have flourished even in Leyden. Though that famous university and renowned commonwealth, which has been as it were a sanctuary for liberty, those fountains and streams of all polite learning, have not yet been able to wash away that slavish rust that sticks to you, and infuse a little humanity into you. Finding yourself destitute of any assistance or help from orthodox protestant divines, you have the impudence to betake yourself to the Sorbonists, whose college you know is devoted to the Romish religion, and consequently but of very weak authority amongst protestants. We are willing to deliver so wicked an assertor of tyranny as you, to be drowned in the Sorbon, as being ashamed to own so despicable a slave as you show yourself to be, by maintaining that the whole body of a nation is not equal in power to the most slothful degenerate prince that may be. You labour in vain to lay that upon the pope, which all free nations, and all orthodox divines own and assert. But the pope and his clergy, when they were in a low condition, and but of small account in the world, were the first authors of this pernicious absurd doctrine of yours: and when by preaching such doctrine they had gotten power into their own hands, they became the worst of tyrants themselves. Yet they engaged all princes to them by the closest tie imaginable, persuading the world that was now besotted with their superstition, that it was unlawful to depose princes, though never so bad, unless the pope dispensed with their allegiance to them, by absolving them from their oaths. But you avoid orthodox writers, and endeavour to burden the truth with prejudice and calumny, by making the pope the first assertor of what is a known and common received opinion amongst them; which if you did not do it cunningly, you would make yourself appear to be neither papist nor protestant, but a kind of mongrel Idumean Herodian. For as they of old adored one most inhuman bloody tyrant for the Messias, so you would have the world fall down and worship all. You boast that "you have confirmed your opinion by the testimonies of the fathers that flourished in the four first centuries; whose writings only are evangelical, and according to the truth of the christian religion." This man is past all shame! how many things did they preach, how many things have they published, which Christ and his apostles never taught? How many things are there in their writings, in which all protestant divines differ from them? But what is that opinion that you have confirmed by their authorities? "Why, That evil princes are appointed by God." Allow that, as all other pernicious and destructive things are. What then? why, "that therefore they have no judge but God alone, that they are above all human laws; that there is no law, written or unwritten, no law of nature, nor of God, to call them to account before their own subjects." But how comes that to pass? Certain I am, that there is no law against it: no penal law excepts kings. And all reason and justice requires, that those that offend, should be punished according to their deserts, without respect of persons. Nor have you hitherto produced any one law, either written or unwritten, of God or of nature, by which this is forbidden. What stands in the way then? Why may not kings be proceeded against? Why, "because they are appointed by God, be they never so bad." I do not know whether I had best call you a knave, or a fool, or ignorant, unlearned barbarian. You show yourself a vile wretch, by propagating a doctrine so destructive and pernicious; and you are a fool for backing it with such silly arguments. God says in Isa. liv. "I have created the slayer to destroy." Then by your reason a murderer is above the laws. Turn this topsy-turvy, and consider it as long as you will, you will find the consequence to be the same with your own. For the pope is appointed by God, just as tyrants are, and set up for the punishment of the church, which I have already demonstrated out of your own writings. "And yet," say you, Wal. Mef. pag. 412. "because he has raised his primacy to an insufferable height of power, so as that he has made it neither better nor worse than plain downright ty-
ranny,

ranny, both he and his bishops may be put down more lawfully than they were at first set up." You tell us that the pope and the bishops (though God in his wrath appointed them) may yet lawfully be rooted out of the church, because they are tyrants; and yet you deny that it is lawful to depose a tyrant in the commonwealth, and that for no other reason than because God appointed him, though he did it in his anger. What ridiculous stuff is this! for whereas the pope cannot hurt a man's conscience against his own will, for in the consciences of men it is that his kingdom consists, yet you are for deposing him as a grievous tyrant, in whose own power it is not to be a tyrant; and yet you maintain that a tyrant properly and truly so called, a tyrant that has all our lives and estates within his reach, without whose assistance the pope himself could not exercise his tyranny in the church, ought for conscience sake to be borne withal and submitted to. These assertions compared with one another, betray your childishness to that degree, that no man can read your books, but must of necessity take notice of your ignorance, rashness, and incogitancy. But you alledge another reason, "human affairs would be turned upside down." They would so, and be changed for the better. Human affairs would certainly be in a deplorable condition, if being once troubled and disordered, there was a necessity of their continuing always so. I say, they would be changed for the better, for the king's power would revert to the people, from whom it was first derived, and conferred upon one of themselves; and the power would be transferred from him that abused it, to them that were prejudiced and injured by the abuse of it; than which nothing can be more just, for there could not well be an Umpire in such a case; who would stand to the judgment of a foreigner? all mankind would equally be subject to the laws; there would be no Gods of flesh and blood: which kind of deities whoever goes about to set up in the world, they are equally injurious to church and commonwealth. Now I must turn your own weapons upon you again. You say, "There can be no greater heresy than this, to set up one man in Christ's seat. These two are infallible marks of Antichrist, infallibility in spirituals, and omnipotence in temporals." Apparatus ad Prim. pag. 171. Do you pretend that kings are infallible? If you do not, why do you make them omnipotent? And how comes it to pass that an unlimited power in one man should be accounted less destructive to temporal things, than it is to ecclesiastical? Or do you think that God takes no care at all of civil affairs? If he takes none himself, I am sure he does not forbid us to take care which way they go. If he does take any care about them, certainly he would have the same reformation made in the commonwealth, that he would have made in the church, especially it being obvious to every man's experience that infallibility and omnipotency being arrogated to one man, are equally mischievous in both. God has not so modelled the government of the world as to make it the duty of any civil community to submit to the cruelties of tyrants, and yet to leave the church at liberty to free themselves from slavery and tyranny; nay, rather quite contrary, he has put no arms into the church's hand but those of patience and innocence, prayer and ecclesiastical discipline; but in the commonwealth, all the magistracy are by him entrusted with the preservation and execution of the laws, with the power of punishing and revenging; he has put the sword into their hands. I cannot but smile at this man's preposterous whimsies; in ecclesiastics he is Helvidius, Thraseas, a perfect Tyrannicide. In politics no man more a lackey and slave to tyrants than he. If his doctrine hold, not we only that have deposed our king, but the protestants in general, who against the minds of their princes have rejected the pope, are all rebels alike. But I have confounded him long enough with his own arguments. Such is the nature of the beast, lest his adversary should be unprovided, he himself furnishes him with weapons. Never did any man give his antagonist greater advantages against himself than he does. They that he has to do withal, will be sooner weary of pursuing him, than he of flying.

C H A P. IV.

Perhaps you think, Salmasius, that you have done enough to ingratiate yourself with princes; that you have deserved well of them: but if they consider their own interest, and take their measures according to what it really is, not according to the false gloss that your flatteries have put upon it, there never was any man in the world that deserved so ill of them as you; none more destructive and pernicious to them and their interest in the whole world than yourself. For by exalting the power of kings above all human laws, you tell all mankind that are subject to such a government, that they are no better than slaves, and make them but the more desirous of liberty by discovering to them their error, and putting that into their heads that they never so much as dreamt of before, to wit, that they are slaves to their princes. And without doubt such a sort of government will be more irksome and unsufferable, by how much the more you persuade the world, that it is not by the allowance and submission of nations, that kings have obtained this exorbitant power; but that it is absolutely essential to such a form of government, and of the nature of the thing itself. So that whether you make the world of your mind or no, your doctrine must needs be mischievous and destructive, and such as cannot but be abhorred of all princes. For if you should work men into a persuasion that the right of kings is without all bounds, they would no longer be subject to a kingly government; if you miss of your aim, yet you make men weary of kings, by telling them that they assume such a power to themselves, as of right belonging to them. But if princes will allow of those principles that I assert; if they will suffer themselves and their own power to be circumscribed by laws, instead of an uncertain, weak, and violent government, full of cares and fears, they will reign peaceably, quietly, and securely. If they slight this counsel of mine, though wholesome in itself, because of the meanness of the author, they shall know that it is not my counsel only, but what was anciently advised by one of the wisest of kings. For Lycurgus king of Lacedemon, when he observed that his own relations that were princes of Argos and Messana, by endeavouring to introduce an arbitrary government, had ruined themselves and their people; he, that he might benefit his country, and secure the succession to his own family, could think upon no better expedient, than to communicate his power to the senate, and taking the great men of the realm into part of the government with himself; and by this means the crown continued in his family for many ages. But whether it was Lycurgus, or, as some learned men are of opinion, Theopompus, that introduced that mixed form of government among the Lacedemonians, somewhat more than a hundred years after Lycurgus's time (of whom it is recorded, that he used to boast, that by advancing the power of the senate above that of the prince, he had settled the kingdom upon a sure foundation, and was like to leave it in a lasting and durable condition to his posterity) which of them soever it was, I say, he has left a good example to modern princes; and was as creditable a counsellor, as his counsel was safe. For that all men should submit to any one man, so as to acknowledge a power in him superior to all human laws, neither did any law ever enact, nor indeed was it possible that any such law should ever be; for that cannot be said to be a law, that strikes at the root of all laws, and takes them quite away: it being apparent, that your positions are inconsistent with the nature of all laws, being such as render them no laws at all. You endeavour notwithstanding, in this fourth chapter, to make good by examples, what you have not been able to do by any reasons that you have alledged hitherto. Let us consider whether your examples help your cause; for they many times make things plain, which the laws are either altogether silent in, or do but hint at. We will begin first with the Jews, whom we suppose to have known most of the mind of God; and then, according to your own method, we will come to the times of christianity. And first, for those times in which the Israelites being,

being subject to kings, who, or howsoever they were, did their utmost to cast that slavish yoke from off their necks. Eglon the king of Moab had made a conquest of them; the seat of his empire was at Jericho; he was no contemner of the true God; when his name was mentioned, he rose from his seat: The Israelites had served him eighteen years; they sent a present to him, not as to an enemy, but to their own prince; notwithstanding which outward veneration and profession of subjection, they kill him by a wile, as an enemy to their country. You will say perhaps, that Ehud, who did that action, had a warrant from God for so doing. He had so, it is like; and what greater argument of its being a warrantable and praise-worthy action? God uses not to put men upon things that are unjust, treacherous and cruel, but upon such things as are virtuous and laudable. But we read no where that there was any positive command from heaven in the case. "The Israelites called upon God;" so did we. And God stirred up a Saviour for them; so he did for us. Eglon of a neighbouring prince became a prince of the Jews; of an enemy to them he became their king. Our gentleman of an English king became an enemy to the English nation; so that he ceased to be a king. Those capacities are inconsistent. No man can be a member of the state, and an enemy to it at the same time. Antony was never looked upon by the Romans as a consul, nor Nero as an emperor, after the senate had voted them both enemies. This Cicero tells us in his Fourth Philippic: "If Antony be a consul," says he, "Brutus is an enemy; but if Brutus be a Saviour and preserver of the commonwealth, Antony is an enemy: none but robbers count him a consul." By the same reason, say I, who but enemies to their country look upon a tyrant as a king? So that Eglon's being a foreigner, and king Charles a prince of our own, will make no difference in the case; both being enemies, and both tyrants, they are in the same circumstances. If Ehud killed him justly, we have done so too in putting our king to death. Samson that renowned champion of the Hebrews, though his country-men blamed him for it, "Dost thou not know," say they, "that the Philistines have dominion over us?" Yet against those Philistines, under whose dominion he was, he himself undertook a war in his own person, without any other help; and whether he acted in pursuance of a command from Heaven, or was prompted by his own valour only; or whatsoever inducement he had, he did not put to death one, but many that tyrannized over his country, having first called upon God by prayer, and implored his assistance. So that Sampson counted it no act of impiety, but quite contrary, to kill those that enslaved his country, though they had dominion over himself too; and though the greater part of his countrymen submitted to their tyranny. "But yet David, who was both a king and a prophet, would not take away Saul's life, because he was God's anointed." Does it follow that because David refused to do a thing, therefore we are obliged not to do that very thing? David was a private person, and would not kill the king; is that a precedent for a parliament, for a whole nation? David would not revenge his own quarrel, by putting his enemy to death by stealth; does it follow that therefore the magistrates must not punish a malefactor according to law? He would not kill a king; must not an assembly of the states therefore punish a tyrant? He scrupled the killing of God's anointed; must the people therefore scruple to condemn their own anointed? especially one that after having so long professed hostility against his own people, had washed off that anointing of his, whether sacred or civil, with the blood of his own subjects. I confess that those kings whom God by his prophets anointed to be kings, or appointed to some special service, as he did Cyrus, Isa. xlv. may not improperly be called the Lord's anointed; but all other princes, according to the several ways of their coming to the government, are the people's anointed, or the army's, or many times the anointed of their own faction only. But taking it for granted, that all kings are God's anointed, you can never prove, that therefore they are above all laws, and not to be called in question, what villanies soever they commit. What if

David

David laid a charge upon himself and other private persons not to stretch forth their hands against the Lord's anointed? Does not God himself command princes not so much as "to touch his Anointed?" Which were no other than his people, Psal. cv. He preferred that anointing wherewith his people were anointed, before that of king's, if any such thing were. Would any man offer to infer from this place of the Psalmist, that believers are not to be called in question, though they offend against the laws, because God commands princes not to touch his anointed? King Solomon was about to put to death Abiathar the priest, though he were God's anointed too; and did not spare him because of his Anointing, but because he had been his father's friend. If that sacred and civil anointing, wherewith the high-priest of the Jews was anointed, whereby he was not only constituted high-priest, but a temporal magistrate in many cases, did not exempt him from the penalty of the laws; how comes a civil anointing only to exempt a tyrant? But you say, "Saul was a tyrant, and worthy of Death." What then? It does not follow, that because he deserved it, that David in the circumstances he was then under, had power to put him to death without the people's authority, or the command of the magistracy. But was Saul a tyrant? I wish you would say so; indeed you do so, though you had said before in your Second Book, page 32. That "he was no tyrant, but a good king, and chosen of God." Why should false accusers, and men guilty of forgery be branded, and you escape without the like ignominious mark? For they practise their villanies with less treachery and deceit than you write, and treat of matters of the greatest moment. Saul was a good king, when it served your turn to have him so; and now he's a tyrant, because it suits with your present purpose. But it is no wonder that you make a tyrant of a good king; for your principles look as if they were invented for no other design, than to make all good kings so. But yet David, though he would not put to death his father-in-law, for causes and reasons that we have nothing to do withal, yet in his own defence he raised an army, took and possessed cities that belonged to Saul, and would have defended Keilah against the king's forces, had he not understood that the citizens would be false to him. Suppose Saul had besieged the town, and himself had been the first that had scaled the walls; do you think David would presently have thrown down his arms, and have betrayed all those that assisted him to his anointed enemy? I believe not. What reason have we to think David would have stuck to do what we have done, who when his occasions and circumstances so required, proffered his assistance to the Philistines, who were then the professed enemies of his country, and did that against Saul, which I am sure we should never have done against our tyrant? I am weary of mentioning your lies, and ashamed of them. You say, it is a maxim of the English, "That enemies are rather to be spared than friends;" and that therefore "we conceived we ought not to spare our king's life, because he had been our friend." You impudent liar, what mortal ever heard this whimsy before you invented it? But we will excuse it. You could not bring in that threadbare flourish, of our being more fierce than our own mastiffs (which now comes in the fifth time, and will as oft again before we come to the end of your book) without some such introduction. We are not so much more fierce than our own mastiffs, as you are more hungry than any dog whatsoever, who return so greedily to what you have vomited up so often. Then you tell us, that David commanded the Amalekite to be put to death, who pretended to have killed Saul. But that instance, neither in respect of the fact, nor the person, has any affinity with what we are discoursing of. I do not well understand what cause David had to be so severe upon that man, for pretending to have hastened the king's death, and in effect but to have put him out of his pain, when he was dying; unless it were to take away from the Israelites all suspicion of his own having been instrumental in it, whom they might look upon as one that had revolted to the Philistines, and was part of their army. Just such another action as this of David's, do all men blame in Domitian, who put to death Epaphroditus, because he had helped Nero to kill himself.

himself. After all this, as another instance of your impudence, you call him not only the "anointed of the Lord," but "the Lord's Christ," who a little before you had said was a tyrant, and acted by the impulse of some evil spirit. Such mean thoughts you have of that reverend name, that you are not ashamed to give it to a tyrant, whom you yourself confess to have been possessed with the devil. Now I come to that precedent, from which every man that is not blind, must needs infer the right of the people to be superior to that of kings. When Solomon was dead, the people assembled themselves at Sichem to make Rehoboam king. Thither himself went, as one that stood for the place, that he might not seem to claim the succession as his inheritance, nor the same right over a free-born people that every man has over his father's sheep and oxen. The people propose conditions, upon which they were willing to admit him to the government. He desires three days time to advise; he consults with the old men; they tell him no such thing, as that he had an absolute right to succeed, but persuade him to comply with the people, and speak them fair, it being in their power whether he should reign or not. Then he advises with the young men that were brought up with him; they, as if Salmasius's phrenzy had taken them, thunder this right of kings into his ears; persuade him to threaten the people with Whips and Scorpions: And he answered the people as they advised him. When all Israel saw that the king hearkened not to them, then they openly protest the right of the people, and their own liberty; "What portion have we in David? To thy tents, O Israel? now look to thine own house David." When the king sent Adoram to them, they stoned him with stones, and perhaps they would not have stuck to have served the king himself so, but he made haste and got out of the way. The next news is of a great army raised by Rehoboam to reduce the Israelites to their allegiance. God forbids him to proceed, "Go not up," says he, "to war against your brethren the children of Israel; for this thing is of me." Now consider; heretofore the people had desired a king; God was displeased with them for it, but yet permitted them to make a king according to that right that all nations have to appoint their own governors. Now the people reject Rehoboam from ruling them; and this God not only suffers them to do, but forbids Rehoboam to make war against them for it, and stops him in his undertaking; and teaches him withal, that those that had revolted from him, were not rebels in so doing; but that he ought to look upon them as brethren. Now recollect yourself: you say that all kings are of God, and that therefore the people ought not to resist them, be they never such tyrants. I answer you, the convention of the people, their votes, their acts, are likewise of God, and that by the testimony of God himself in this place; and consequently according to your argument, by the authority of God himself, princes ought not to resist the people. For as certain as it is, that kings are of God, and whatever argument you may draw from thence to enforce a subjection and obedience to them: So certain is it, that free assemblies of the body of the people are of God, and that naturally affords the same argument for their right of restraining princes from going beyond their bounds, and rejecting them if there be occasion; nor is their so doing a justifiable cause of war, any more than the people of Israel's rejecting Rehoboam was. You ask, why the people did not revolt from Solomon? Who but you would ask such an impertinent question? You see they did revolt from a tyrant, and were neither punished nor blamed for it. It is true, Solomon fell into some vices, but he was not therefore a tyrant; he made amends for his vices by many excellent virtues, that he was famous for, by many benefits which accrued to the nation of the Jews by his government. But admit that he had been a tyrant: many times the circumstances of a nation are such, that the people will not, and many times such, that they cannot depose a tyrant. You see they did it when it was in their power. "But," say you, "Jeroboam's act was ever had in detestation; it was looked upon as an unjust revolt from a lawful prince; he and his successors were accounted rebels." I confess we find his revolt from the true worship of God often found fault with;

with ; but I no where find him blamed for revolting from Rehoboam ; and his successors are frequently spoken of as wicked princes, but not as rebels. " Acting contrary to law and right," say you, " cannot introduce, or establish a right." I pray, what becomes then of your right of kings ? Thus do you perpetually baffle yourself. You say, " Adulteries, murders, thefts are daily committed with impunity. Are you not aware, that here you give an answer to your own question, how it comes to pass, that tyrants do so often escape unpunished ? You say, " Those kings were rebels, and yet the prophets do no where dissuade the people from their allegiance. And why do you, you rascally false prophet, endeavour to persuade the people of England not to yield obedience to their present magistrates, though in your opinion they are rebels ? " This English faction of robbers," say you, " alledge for themselves, that by some immediate voice from heaven, they were put upon their bloody enterprize." It is notoriously evident, that you were distracted when you wrote these lines ; for as you have put the words together, they are neither Latin, nor sense. And that the English pretend to any such warrant, as a justification of their actions, is one of those many lies and fictions that your book is full of. But I proceed to urge you with examples. Libna, a great city revolted from Joram, because he had forsaken God : it was the king therefore that was guilty, not the city, nor is the city blamed for it. He that considers the reason that is given why that city rejected his government, must conclude that the Holy Ghost rather approves of what they did, than condemns them for it. " These kind of revolts are no precedents," say you. But why were you then so vain, as to promise in the beginning of this chapter, that you would argue from examples, whereas all the examples that you alledge, are meer negatives, which prove nothing ? and when we urge examples that are solid and positive, you say they are no precedents. Who would endure such a way of arguing ? You challenged us at precedents ; we produced them ; and what do you do ? you hang back, and get out of the way. I proceed : Jehu at the command of a prophet, slew a king ; nay, he ordered the death of Ahaziah, his own liege prince. If God would not have tyrants put to death by their own subjects, if it were a wicked thing so to do, a thing of a bad example ; why did God himself command it ? If he commanded it, it was a lawful, commendable, and a praise-worthy action. It was not therefore lawful to kill a tyrant, because God commanded it ; but God commanded it, because, antecedently to his command, it was a justifiable and a lawful action. Again, Jehoiada the high-priest did not scruple to depose Athaliah, and kill her, though she had been seven years in actual possession of the crown. " But," say you, " she took upon her the government when she had no right to it." And did not you say yourself, but a while ago, " That Tiberius assumed the sovereignty when it belonged not at all to him ?" And yet you then affirmed, that according to our Saviour's doctrine, we ought to yield obedience to such tyrants as he was. 'Twere a most ridiculous thing to imagine, that a prince, who gets in by usurpation, may lawfully be deposed ; but one that rules tyrannically may not. " But," say you, Athaliah could not possibly reign according to the law of the Jewish kingdom, " Thou shalt set over thee a king, says God Almighty ; he does not say, Thou shalt set over thee a queen." If this argument have any weight, I may as well say, the command of God was, that the people should set over themselves a king, not a tyrant. So that I am even with you. Amazias was a slothful, idolatrous prince, and was put to death, not by a few conspirators ; but rather, it should seem, by the nobility, and by the body of the people. For he fled from Jerusalem, had none to stand by him, and they pursued him to Lachish : They took counsel against him, says the history, because he had forsaken God : and we do not find that Azarias his son prosecuted those that had cut off his father. You quote a great many frivolous passages out of the Rabbins, to prove that the kings of the Jews were superior to the Sanhedrim. You do not consider Zedekiah's own words, Jerem. xxxviii. " The king is not he that can do any thing against you." So that this was the prince's own stile. Thus he confessed himself inferior to the great council of the realm. " Perhaps," say you, " he meant

that he durst not deny them any thing for fear of sedition." But what does your perhaps signify, whose most positive asserting any thing is not worth a louse? For nothing in nature can be more fickle and inconsistent than you are. How oft have you appeared in this discourse inconsistent with yourself; unsaying with one breath what you have said with another? Here, again, you make comparisons betwixt king Charles, and some of the good kings of Judah. You speak contemptibly of David, as if he were not worthy to come in competition with him. "Consider David," say you, "an adulterer, a murderer; king Charles was guilty of no such crimes. Solomon his son, who was accounted wise, &c." Who can with patience hear this filthy, rascally fool, speak so irreverently of persons eminent both in greatness and piety? Dare you compare king David with king Charles; a most religious king and prophet, with a superstitious prince, and who was but a novice in the christian religion; a most prudent wise prince with a weak one; a valiant prince with a cowardly one; finally, a most just prince with a most unjust one? Have you the impudence to commend his chastity and sobriety, who is known to have committed all manner of lewdness in company with his confident the duke of Buckingham? It were to no purpose to enquire into the private actions of his life, who publickly at plays would embrace and kiss the ladies lasciviously, and handle virgins and matrons' breasts, not to mention the rest? I advise you therefore, you counterfeit Plutarch, to abstain from such like parallels, lest I be forced to publish those things concerning king Charles, which I am willing to conceal. Hitherto we have entertained ourselves with what the people of the Jews have acted or attempted against tyrants, and by what right they did it in those times, when God himself did immediately, as it were, by his voice from heaven govern their commonwealth. The ages that succeeded, do not afford us any authority, as from themselves, but confirm us in our opinion by their imitating the actions of their fore-fathers. For after the Babylonish captivity, when God did not give any new command concerning the crown, though the royal line was not extinct, we find the people return to the old mosaical form of government again. They were one while tributaries to Antiochus, king of Syria; yet when he enjoined them things that were contrary to the law of God, they resisted him, and his deputies, under the conduct of their priests, the Maccabees, and by force regained their former liberty. After that, whoever was accounted most worthy of it, had the principality conferred upon him. 'Till at last, Hircanus the Son of Simon, the brother of Judah, the Maccabee, having spoiled David's sepulchre, entertained foreign soldiers, and began to invest the priesthood with a kind of regal power. After whose time his son Aristobulus was the first that assumed the crown; he was a tyrant indeed, and yet the people stirred not against him, which is no great wonder, for he reigned but one year. And he himself being overtaken with a grievous disease, and repenting of his own cruelty and wickedness, desired nothing more than to die, and had his wish. His brother Alexander succeeded him; "and against him," you say, "the people raised no insurrection," though he were a tyrant too. And this lie might have gone down with us, if Josephus's history had not been extant. We should then have had no memory of those times, but what your Josippus would afford us, out of whom you transcribe a few senseless and useless apothegms of the Pharisees. The History is thus: Alexander administered the public affairs ill, both in war and peace; and though he kept in pay great numbers of Pisidians and Cilicians, yet could he not protect himself from the rage of the people: but whilst he was sacrificing they fell upon him, and had almost smothered him with boughs of palm trees and citron-trees. Afterward the whole nation made war upon him six years, during which time, when many thousands of the Jews had been slain, and he himself being at length desirous of peace, demanded of them, what they would have him do to satisfy them; they told him nothing could do that, but his blood, nay, that they should hardly pardon him after his death. This history you perceived was not for your purpose, and so you put it off with a few pharisaical sentences; when it had been much better, either to have let it quite

quite alone, or to have given a true relation of it: but you trust to lies more than to the truth of your cause. Even those eight hundred Pharisees, whom he commanded to be crucified, were of their number that had taken up arms against him. And they with the rest of the people had solemnly protested, that if they could subdue the king's forces, and get his person into their power, they would put him to death. After the death of Alexander, his wife Alexandra took the government upon her; as Athaliah had formerly done, not according to law (for you have confessed, that the laws of the Jews admitted not a female to wear the crown) but she got it partly by force, for she maintained an army of foreigners; and partly by favour, for she had brought over the Pharisees to her interest, which sort of men were of the greatest authority with the people. Them she had made her own, by putting the power into their hands, and retaining to herself only the name. Just as the Scotch presbyterians lately allowed Charles the name of king, but upon condition, that he would let them be king in effect. After the death of Alexandra, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, her sons, contended for the sovereignty: Aristobulus was more industrious, and having a greater party, forced his elder brother out of the kingdom. A while after, when Pompey passed through Syria, in his return from the Mithridatic war; the Jews, supposing they had now an opportunity of regaining their liberty, by referring their cause to him, dispatch an embassy to him in their own names; they renounce both the brothers; complain that they had enslaved them. Pompey deposed Aristobulus, leaves the priesthood, and such a principality as the laws allowed to Hyrcanus the elder. From that time forward he was called High-priest, and Ethnarcha. After these times in the reign of Archelaus, the son of Herod, the Jews sent fifty ambassadors to Augustus Cæsar; accused Herod that was dead, and Archelaus his son, that then reigned; they deposed him as much as in them lay, and petitioned the emperor, that the people of the Jews might be governed without a king. Cæsar was moved at their entreaty, and did not appoint a king over them, but a governor, whom they called an Ethnarch. When that governor had presided ten years over Judea, the people sent ambassadors again to Rome, and accused him of tyranny. Cæsar heard them graciously; sent for the governor, condemned him to perpetual exile, and banished him to Vienna. Answer me now, that people that accused their own princes, that desired their condemnation, that desired their punishment, would not they themselves rather, if it had been in their power, and that they might have had their choice; would not they, I say, rather have put them to death themselves? You do not deny, but that the people, and the nobles often took up arms against the Roman deputies, when by their avarice, or their cruelty, their government was burdensome and oppressive. But you give a ridiculous reason for this, as all the rest of yours are. You say, "They were not yet accustomed to the yoke;" very like they were not, under Alexander, Herod, and his son. "But," say you, they would not raise war against Caius Cæsar, nor Petronius." I confess they did not, and they did very prudently in abstaining, for they were not able. Will you hear their own words on that occasion? "We will not make war," say they, "because we cannot." That thing which they themselves acknowledge, they refrained from for want of ability; you, false hypocrite, pretend they abstained from out of religion. Then with a great deal of toil you do just nothing at all; for you endeavour to prove out of the fathers (though you had done it as superficially before) that kings are to be prayed for. That good kings are to be prayed for, no man denies; nay, and bad ones too, as long as there are any hopes of them: so we ought to pray for highwaymen, and for our enemies. But how? not that they may plunder, spoil and murder us; but that they may repent. We pray both for thieves and enemies; and yet who ever dreamt but that it was lawful to put the laws in execution against one, and to fight against the other? I value not the Egyptian liturgy that you quote; but the priest that you mention, who prayed that Commodus might succeed his father in the empire, did not pray for any thing in my opinion, but imprecated all the mischiefs imaginable to the Roman state.

You say, "that we have broken our faith, which we engaged more than once in solemn assemblies to preserve the authority and majesty of the king" But because hereafter you are more large upon that subject, I shall pass it by in this place; and talk with you when you come to it again. You return then to the fathers; concerning whom take this in short. Whatever they say, which is not warranted by the authority of the scriptures, or by good reason, shall be of no more regard with me, than if any other ordinary man had said it. The first that you quote is Tertullian, who is no orthodox writer, notorious for many errors; whose authority, if he were of your opinion, would stand you in no stead. But what says he? He condemns tumults and rebellions. So do we. But in saying so, we do not mean to destroy all the people's rights and privileges, all the authority of senates, the power of all magistrates, the king only excepted. The fathers declaim against seditions rashly raised, by the giddy heat of the multitude; they speak not of the inferior magistrates, of senates, of parliaments encouraging the people to a lawful opposing of a tyrant. Hence Ambrose, whom you quote; "Not to resist, says he, but to weep and to sigh, these are the bulwarks of the priesthood; what one is there of our little number who dare say to the emperor, I do not like your laws? This is not allowed the priests, and shall lay-men pretend to it?" It is evident of what sort of persons he speaks, viz. of the priests, and such of the people as are private men, not of the magistrates. You see by how weak and preposterous a reason he lighted a torch as it were to the dissensions that were afterwards to arise betwixt the laity and the clergy concerning even civil or temporal laws. But because you think you press hardest upon us with the examples of the primitive christians; who tho' they were harassed as much as a people could be, yet, you say, "they never took up arms against the emperor:" I will make it appear, in the first place, that for the most part they could not: Secondly, that whenever they could, they did: And thirdly, that whether they did or did not, they were such a sort of people, as that their example deserves but to have little sway with us. First therefore, no man can be ignorant of this, that when the commonwealth of Rome expired, the whole and sovereign power in the empire was settled in the emperor; that all the soldiers were under his pay; insomuch that if the whole body of the senate, the Equestrian order, and all the common people had endeavoured to work a change, they might have made way for a massacre of themselves, but could not in any probability retrieve their lost liberty: for the empire would still have continued, tho' they might perhaps have been so lucky as to have killed the emperor. This being so, what could the christians do? It is true, there were a great many of them; but they were dispersed, they were generally persons of mean quality, and but of small interest in the world. How many of them would one legion have been able to keep in awe? Could so inconsiderable a body of men as they were in those days, ever expect to accomplish an enterprize that many famous generals, and whole armies of tried soldiers had lost their lives in attempting? When about 300 years after our Saviour's nativity, which was near upon 20 years before the reign of Constantine the great, when Dioclesian was emperor, there was but one christian legion in the whole Roman empire; which legion, for no other reason than because it consisted of christians, was slain by the rest of the army at a town in France called Oëtodurum. "The christians, say you, conspired not with Cassius, with Albinus, with Niger;" and does Tertullian think they merited by not being willing to lose their lives in the quarrels of infidels? It is evident therefore that the christians could not free themselves from the yoke of the Roman emperors; and it could be no ways advantageous to their interest to conspire with infidels, as long as heathen emperors reigned. But that afterwards the christians made war upon tyrants, and defended themselves by force of arms when there was occasion, and many times revenged upon tyrants their enormities, I am now about to make appear. In the first place, Constantine being a christian, made war upon Licinius, and cut him off, who was his partner in the sovereign power, because he molested the Eastern christians; by which act of his he declared thus much at least, that one magistrate

strate might punish another: For he for his subjects sake punished Licinius, who to all intents was as absolute in the empire as himself, and did not leave the vengeance to God alone: Licinius might have done the same to Constantine, if there had been the like occasion. So then, if the matter be not wholly reserved to God's own tribunal, but that men have something to do in the case, why did not the parliament of England stand in the same relation to king Charles, that Constantine did to Licinius? The Soldiers made Constantine what he was: But our laws have made our parliaments equal, nay, superior to our kings. The inhabitants of Constantinople resisted Constantius an Arian emperor, by force of arms, as long as they were able; they opposed Hermogenes whom he had sent with a military power to depose Paul an orthodox bishop; the house whither he had betaken himself for security, they fired about his ears, and at last killed him right-out. Constans threatened to make war upon his brother Constantius, unless he would restore Paul and Athanasius to their bishoprics. You see those holy fathers, when their bishoprics were in danger, were not ashamed to stir up their prince's own brother to make war upon him. Not long after, the christian soldiers, who then made whom they would emperors, put to death Constans the son of Constantinus, because he behaved himself dissolutely and proudly in the government, and translated the empire to Magnentius. Nay, those very persons that saluted Julian by the name of emperor, against Constantius's will, who was actually in possession of the empire, (for Julian was not then an apostate, but a virtuous and valiant person) are they not amongst the number of those primitive christians, whose example you propose to us for our imitation? Which action of theirs, when Constantius by his letters to the people very sharply and earnestly forbade, (which letters were openly read to them) they all cried out unanimously, that themselves had but done what the provincial magistrates, the army, and the authority of the commonwealth had decreed. The same persons declared war against Constantius, and contributed as much as in them lay, to deprive him both of his government and his life. How did the inhabitants of Antioch behave themselves, who were none of the worst sort of christians? I'll warrant you they prayed for Julian, after he became an apostate, whom they used to rail at in his own presence, and scoffing at his long beard bid him make ropes of it: Upon the news of whose death they offered public thanksgivings, made feasts, and gave other public demonstrations of joy. Do you think they used when he was alive, to pray for the continuance of his life and health? Nay, is it not reported, that a christian soldier, in his own army was the author of his death? Sozomen, a writer of ecclesiastical history, does not deny it, but commends him that did it, if the fact were so: 'For it is no wonder, says he, that some of his own soldiers might think within himself, that not only the Greeks, but all mankind hitherto had agreed that it was a commendable action to kill a tyrant; and that they deserve all men's praise, who are willing to die themselves to procure the liberty of all others: So that that soldier ought not rashly to be condemned, who in the cause of God and of religion, was so zealous and valiant.' These are the words of Sozomen, a good and religious man of that age. By which we may easily apprehend what the general opinion of pious men in those days was upon this point. Ambrose himself being commanded by the emperor Valentinian the younger, to depart from Milan, refused to obey him, but defended himself and the palace by force of arms against the emperor's officers, and took upon him, contrary to his own doctrine, to resist the higher powers. There was a great sedition raised at Constantinople against the emperor Arcadius, more than once, by reason of Chrysostom's exile. Hitherto I have shewn how the primitive christians behaved themselves towards tyrants; how not only the christian soldiers, and the people, but the fathers of the church themselves, have both made war upon them, and opposed them with force, and all this before St. Austin's time: for you yourself are pleased to go down no lower; and therefore I make no mention of Valentinian the son of Placidia, who was slain by Maximus a senator, for committing adultery with his wife; nor do I mention Avitus the emperor, whom, be-
cause

cause he disbanded the soldiers, and betook himself wholly to a luxurious life, the Roman senate immediately deposed; because these things came to pass some years after St. Austin's death. But all this I give you: suppose I had not mentioned the practice of the primitive christians; suppose they never had stirred in opposition to tyrants; suppose they had accounted it unlawful so to do; I will make it appear that they were not such persons, as that we ought to rely upon their authority, or can safely follow their example. Long before Constantine's time the generality of christians had lost much of the primitive sanctity and integrity both of their doctrine and manners. Afterwards, when he had vastly enriched the Church, they began to fall in love with honour and civil power, and then the christian religion went to wreck. First luxury and sloth, and then a great drove of heresies and immoralities broke loose among them; and these begot envy, hatred and discord, which abounded every where. At last, they that were linked together into one brotherhood by that holy band of religion, were as much at variance and strife among themselves as the most bitter enemies in the world could be. No reverence for, no consideration of their duty was left among them: the soldiers and commanders of the army, as oft as they pleased themselves, created new Emperors, and sometimes killed good ones as well as bad. I need not mention such as Verannio, Maximus, Eugenius, whom the soldiers all of a sudden advanced and made them emperors; nor Gratian, an excellent prince; nor Valentinian the younger, who was none of the worst, and yet were put to death by them. It is true, these things were acted by the soldiers, and soldiers in the field; but those soldiers were christians, and lived in that age which you call evangelical, and whose example you propose to us for our imitation. Now you shall hear how the clergy managed themselves: pastors and bishops, and sometimes those very fathers whom we admire and extol to so high a degree, every one of whom was a leader of their several flocks; those very men, I say, fought for their bishoprics, as tyrants did for their sovereignty; sometimes throughout the city, sometimes in the very churches, sometimes at the altar, clergy-men and lay-men fought promiscuously; they slew one another, and great slaughters were made on both sides. You may remember Damasus and Ursinus, who were contemporaries with Ambrose. It would be too long to relate the tumultuary insurrections of the inhabitants of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, especially those under the conduct and management of Cyrillus, whom you extol as a preacher up of obedience; when the monks in that fight, within the city, had almost slain Orestes, Theodosius's deputy. Now who can sufficiently wonder at your impudence, or carelessness and neglect? "Till St. Austin's time, say you, and lower down than the age that he lived in, there is not any mention extant in history, of any private person, of any commander, or of any number of conspirators, that have put their prince to death, or taken up arms against him." I have named to you out of known and approved histories, both private persons and magistrates, that with their own hands have slain not only bad, but very good princes: whole armies of christians, many bishops among them, that have fought against their own emperors. You produce some of the fathers, that with a great flourish of words, persuade or boast of obedience to princes: And I, on the other side, produce both those same fathers, and others besides them, that by their actions have declined obedience to their princes, even in lawful things; have defended themselves with a military force against them; others that have opposed forcibly, and wounded their deputies; and others that being competitors for bishoprics, have maintained civil wars against one another: As if it were lawful for christians to wage war with christians for a bishopric, and citizens with citizens; but unlawful to fight against a tyrant, in defence of our liberty, of our wives and children, and of our lives themselves. Who would own such fathers as these? You produce St. Austin, who you say, asserts that "the power of a master over his servants, and a prince over his subjects, is one and the same thing." But I answer; if St. Austin assert any such thing, he asserts what neither our Saviour, nor any of his Apostles ever asserted; tho' for the con-
firma-

firmation of that assertion, than which nothing can be more false, he pretends to rely wholly upon their authority. The three or four last pages of this fourth chapter, are stuffed with mere lies, or things carelessly and loosely put together, that are little to the purpose: And that every one that reads them, will discover by what has been said already. For what concerns the pope, against whom you declaim so loudly, I am content you should bawl at him, till you are hoarse. But whereas you endeavour to persuade the ignorant, that "all that called themselves christians, yielded an entire obedience to princes, whether good or bad, till the papal power grew to that height, that it was acknowledged superior to that of the civil magistrate, and till he took upon him to absolve subjects from their allegiance:" I have sufficiently proved by many examples before and since the age that St. Augustine lived in, that nothing can be more false. Neither does that seem to have much more truth in it, which you say in the last place; viz. that pope Zachary absolved the Frenchmen from their oath of allegiance to their king. For Francis Hottoman, who was both a Frenchman, and a lawyer, and a very learned man, in the 13th chapter of his Francogallia, denies that either Chilperic was deposed, or the kingdom translated to Pepin by the pope's authority; and he proves out of very ancient chronicles of that nation, that the whole affair was transacted in the great council of the kingdom, according to the original constitution of that government. Which being once done, the French histories, and pope Zachary himself, deny that there was any necessity of absolving his subjects from their allegiance. For not only Hottoman, but Guiccard, a very eminent historian of that nation, informs us, that the ancient records of the kingdom of France testify, that the subjects of that nation upon the first institution of kingship amongst them, reserved a power to themselves, both of chusing their princes, and of deposing them again, if they thought fit: And that the oath of allegiance which they took, was upon this expresse condition; to wit, that the king should likewise perform what at his coronation he swore to do. So that if kings by misgoverning the people committed to their charge, first broke their own oath to their subjects, there needs no pope to dispense with the people's oaths; the kings themselves by their own perfidiousness having absolved their subjects. And finally, pope Zachary himself, in a letter of his to the French, which you yourself quote, renounces, and ascribes to the people that authority which you say he assumes to himself: For, "if a prince be accountable to the people, being beholden to them for his royalty; if the people, since they make kings, have the same right to depose them, as the very words of that pope are; it is not likely that the Frenchmen would by any oath depart in the least from that ancient right, or ever tie up their own hands, so as not to have the same right that their ancestors always had, to depose bad princes, as well as to honour and obey good ones; nor is it likely that they thought themselves obliged to yield that obedience to tyrants, which they swore to yield only to good princes. A people obliged to obedience by such an oath, is discharged of that obligation, when a lawful prince becomes a tyrant, or gives himself over to sloth and voluptuousness; the rule of justice, the very law of nature dispenses with such a people's allegiance. So that even by the pope's own opinion, the people were under no obligation to yield obedience to Chilperic, and consequently had no need of a dispensation.

CHAP. V.

THOUGH I am of opinion, Salmasius, and always was, that the law of God does exactly agree with the law of nature; so that having shown what the law of God is, with respect to princes, and what the practice has been of the people of God, both Jews and Christians, I have at the same time, and by the same discourse, made appear what is most agreeable to the law of nature: yet because you pretend "to confute us most powerfully by the law of nature," I will be content to admit that to be necessary, which

which before I had thought would be superfluous ; that in this chapter I may demonstrate, that nothing is more suitable to the law of nature, than that punishment be inflicted upon tyrants. Which if I do not evince, I will then agree with you, that likewise by the law of God they are exempt. I do not purpose to frame a long discourse of nature in general, and the original of civil societies ; that argument has been largely handled by many learned men, both Greek and Latin. But I shall endeavour to be as short as may be ; and my design is not so much to confute you (who would willingly have spared this pains) as to show that you confute yourself, and destroy your own positions. I'll begin with that first position which you lay down as a fundamental, and that shall be the ground-work of my ensuing discourse. "The law of nature," say you, "is a principle imprinted on all men's minds, to regard the good of all mankind, considering men as united together in societies. But this innate principle cannot procure that common good, unless, as there are people that must be governed, so that very principle ascertain who shall govern them." To wit, lest the stronger oppress the weaker, and those persons, who for their mutual safety and protection have united themselves together, should be disunited and divided by injury and violence, and reduced to a bestial savage life again. This I suppose is what you mean. "Out of the number of those that united into one body, you say, there must needs have been some chosen, who excelled the rest in wisdom and valour ; that they either by force, or by persuasion, might restrain those that were refractory, and keep them within due bounds. Sometimes it would so fall out that one single person, whose conduct and valour was extraordinary, might be able to do this, and sometimes more assisted one another with their advice and counsel. But since it is impossible that any one man should order all things himself, there was a necessity of his consulting with others, and taking some into part of the government with himself : So that whether a single person reign, or whether the supreme power reside in the body of the people, since it is impossible that all should administer the affairs of the commonwealth, or that one man should do all, the government does always lie upon the shoulders of many." And afterwards you say, "both forms of government, whether by many or a few, or by a single person, are equally according to the law of nature ; for both proceed from the same principle of nature, viz. That it is impossible for any single person so to govern alone, as not to admit others into a share of the government with himself." Though I might have taken all this out of the third book of Aristotle's politics, I chose rather to transcribe it out of your own book ; for you stole it from him, as Prometheus did fire from Jupiter, to the ruin of monarchy, and overthrow of yourself, and your own opinion. For enquire as diligently as you can for your life, into the law of nature, as you have described it, you will not find the least footstep in it of kingly power, as you explain it. "The law of nature," say you, "in ordering who should govern others, respected the universal good of all mankind." It did not then regard the private good of any particular person, not of a prince ; so that the king is for the people, and consequently the people superior to him : which being allowed, it is impossible that princes should have any right to oppress or enslave the people ; that the inferior should have right to tyrannize over the superior. So that since kings cannot pretend to any right to do mischief, the right of the people must be acknowledged, according to the law of nature, to be superior to that of princes ; and therefore by the same right, that before kingship was known, men united their strength and counsels for their mutual safety and defence ; by the same right, that for the preservation of all men's liberty, peace, and safety, they appointed one or more to govern the rest ; by the same right they may depose those very persons, whom for their valour or wisdom they advanced to the government, or any others that rule disorderly, if they find them by reason of their slothfulness, folly, or impiety, unfit for government : since nature does not regard the good of one, or of a few, but of all in general. For what sort of persons were they whom you suppose to have been chosen ? You say, "they were such

such as excelled in courage and conduct," to wit, such as by nature seemed fittest for government; who by reason of their excellent wisdom and valour, were enabled to undertake so great a charge. The consequence of this I take to be, that right of succession is not by the law of nature; that no man by the law of nature has right to be king, unless he excel all others in wisdom and courage; that all such as reign, and want these qualifications, are advanced to the government by force or faction; have no right by the law of nature to be what they are, but ought rather to be slaves than princes. For nature appoints that wise men should govern fools, not that wicked men should rule over good men, fools over wise men: and consequently they that take the government out of such men's hands, act according to the law of nature. To what end nature directs wise men should bear the rule, you shall hear in your own words; viz. "That by force or by persuasion, they may keep such as are unruly, within due bounds." But how should he keep others within the bounds of their duty, that neglects, or is ignorant of, or wilfully acts contrary to his own? Alledge now, if you can, any dictate of nature, by which we are enjoined to neglect the wise institutions of the law of nature, and have no regard to them in civil and public concerns, when we see what great and admirable things nature herself effects in things that are inanimate and void of sense, rather than lose her end. Produce any rule of nature, or natural justice, by which inferior criminals ought to be punished, but kings and princes to go unpunished; and not only so, but though guilty of the greatest crimes imaginable, be had in reverence, and almost adored. You agree, That "all forms of government, whether by many, or few, or by a single person, are equally agreeable to the law of nature." So that the person of a king is not by the law of nature more sacred than a senate of nobles, or magistrates, chosen from amongst the common people, who you grant may be punished, and ought to be if they offend; and consequently, kings ought to be so too, who are appointed to rule for the very same end and purpose that other magistrates are. "For," say you, "Nature does not allow any single person to bear rule so entirely, as not to have partners in the government." It does not therefore allow of a monarch; it does not allow one single person to rule so, as that all others should be in a slavish subjection to his commands only. You that give princes such partners in the government, "as in whom," to use your own words, "the government always resides," do at the same time make others colleagues with them, and equal to them; nay, and consequently you settle a power in those colleagues of punishing, and of deposing them. So that while you yourself go about, not to extol a kingly government, but to establish it by the law of nature, you destroy it; no greater misfortune could befall sovereign princes, than to have such an advocate as you are. Poor unhappy wretch! what blindness of mind has seized you, that you should unwittingly take so much pains to discover your knavery and folly, and make it visible to the world, (which before you concealed in some measure, and disguised) that you should be so industrious to heap disgrace and ignominy upon yourself? What offence does heaven punish you for, in making you appear in public, and undertake the defence of a desperate cause, with so much impudence and childishness, and instead of defending it, to betray it by your ignorance? What enemy of yours would desire to see you in a more forlorn, despicable condition than you are, who have no refuge left from the depth of misery, but in your own imprudence and want of sense, since by your unskilful and silly defence, you have rendered tyrants the more odious and detestable, by ascribing to them an unbounded liberty of doing mischief with impunity; and consequently have created them more enemies than they had before? But I return to your contradictions. When you had resolved with yourself to be so wicked as to endeavour to find out a foundation for tyranny in the law of nature, you saw a necessity of extolling monarchy above other sorts of government; which you cannot go about to do, without doing as you use to do, that is, contradicting yourself. For having said but a little before, "That all forms of government, whether by more or fewer, or by a single person, are equally according to the law of nature," now you tell us, "that of all these sorts of government, that of a

single person is most natural :” nay, though you had said in express terms but lately, “ that the law of nature does not allow that any government should reside intirely in one man.” Now upbraid whom you will with the putting of tyrants to death ; since you yourself, by your own folly, have cut the throats of all monarchs, nay, even of monarchy itself. But it is not to the purpose for us here to dispute which form of government is best, by one single person, or by many. I confess many eminent and famous men have extolled monarchy ; but it has always been upon this supposition, that the prince were a very excellent person, and one that of all others deserved best to reign ; without which supposition, no form of government can be so prone to tyranny as monarchy is. And whereas you resemble a monarchy to the government of the world, by one divine Being, I pray answer me, whether you think that any other can deserve to be invested with a power here on earth, that shall resemble his power that governs the world, except such a person as does infinitely excel all other men, and both for wisdom and goodness in some measure resemble the Deity ? and such a person, in my opinion, none can be but the Son of God himself. And whereas you make a kingdom to be a kind of family, and make a comparison betwixt a prince and the master of a family ; observe how lame the parallel is. For a master of a family begot part of his household, at least he feeds all those that are of his house, and upon that account deserves to have the government ; but the reason holds not in the case of a prince ; nay, it is quite contrary. In the next place, you propose to us for our imitation the example of inferior creatures, especially of birds, and amongst them of bees, which according to your skill in natural philosophy, are a sort of birds too ; “ The bees have a king over them.” The bees of Trent you mean ; do not you remember ? all other bees, you yourself confess to be commonwealths. But leave off playing the fool with bees ; they belong to the Muses, and hate, and (you see) confute such a beetle as you are. “ The quails are under a captain.” Lay such snares for your own bitterns ; you are not fowler good enough to catch us. Now you begin to be personally concerned. Gallus Gallinaceus, a cock, say you, “ has both cocks and hens under him.” How can that be, since you yourself that are Gallus, and but too much Gallinaceus, by report cannot govern your own single hen, but let her govern you ? So that if a Gallinaceus be a king over many hens, you that are a slave to one, must own yourself not to be so good as a Gallinaceus, but some Stercorarius Gallus, some dunghill-cock or other. For matter of books, there is no body publishes huger dunghills than you, and you disturb all people with your shitten cock-crow ; that is the only property in which you resemble a true cock. I will throw you a great many barley-corns, if in ransacking this dunghill book of yours, you can show me but one jewel. But why should I promise you barley, that never pecked at corn, as that honest plain cock that we read of in Æsop, but at gold, as that roguey cock in Plautus, though with a different event ; for you found a hundred Jacobusses, and he was struck dead with Euclio’s club, which you deserve more than he did. But let us go on : “ That same natural reason that designs the good and safety of all mankind, requires, that whoever is once promoted to the sovereignty, be preserved in the possession of it. Whoever questioned this, as long as his preservation is consistent with the safety of all the rest ? But is it not obvious to all men that nothing can be more contrary to natural reason, than that any one man should be preserved and defended, to the utter ruin and destruction of all others ? But yet (you say) “ it is better to keep and defend a bad prince, nay one of the worst that ever was, than to change him for another ; because his ill government cannot do the commonwealth so much harm as the disturbances will occasion, which must of necessity be raised before the people can get rid of him.” But what is this to the right of kings by the law of nature ? If nature teaches me rather to suffer myself to be robbed by highwaymen, or if I should be taken captive by such, to purchase my liberty with all my estate, than to fight with them for my life, can you infer from thence, that they have a natural right to rob and spoil me ? Nature teaches men to give way sometimes to the violence and outrages of tyrants, the necessity of affairs sometimes enforces a toleration with their enormities ;
what

what foundation can you find in this forced patience of a nation, in this compulsory submission, to build a right upon, for princes to tyrannize by the law of nature? That right which nature has given the people for their own preservation, can you affirm that she has invested tyrants with for the people's ruin and destruction? Nature teaches us, of two evils to chuse the least; and to bear with oppression, as long as there is a necessity of so doing; and will you infer from hence, that tyrants have some right by the law of nature to oppress their subjects, and go unpunished, because, as circumstances may fall out, it may sometimes be a less mischief to bear with them than to remove them? Remember what yourself once wrote concerning bishops against a jesuit; you were then of another opinion than you are now: I have quoted your words formerly; you there affirm "that seditious civil dissensions and discords of the nobles and common people against and amongst one another, are much more tolerable, and less mischievous than certain misery and destruction under the government of a single person, that plays the tyrant." And you said very true. For you had not then run mad; you had not then been bribed with Charles his Jacobusses. You had not got the King's-Evil. I should tell you perhaps, if I did not know you, that you might be ashamed thus to prevaricate. But you can sooner burst than blush, who have cast off all shame for a little profit. Did you not remember, that the commonwealth of the people of Rome flourished and became glorious when they had banished their kings? Could you possibly forget that of the Low Countries? which, after it had shook off the yoke of the king of Spain, after long and tedious wars, but crowned with success, obtained its liberty, and feeds such a pitiful grammarian as yourself with a pension: but not with a design that their youth might be so infatuated by your sophistry, as to chuse rather to return to their former slavery than inherit the glorious liberty which their ancestors purchased for them. May those pernicious principles of yours be banished with yourself into the most remote and barbarous corners of the world. And last of all, the commonwealth of England might have afforded you an example, in which Charles, who had been their king, after he had been taken captive in war, and was found incurable, was put to death. But "they have defaced and impoverished the island with civil broils and discords, which under its kings was happy, and swam in luxury." Yea, when it was almost buried in luxury and voluptuousness, and the more inured thereto, that it might be enthralled the more easily; when its laws were abolished, and its religion agreed to be sold, they delivered it from slavery. You are like him that published Simplicius and Epictetus in the same volume; a very grave stoic, "who call an island happy, because it swims in luxury." I am sure no such doctrine ever came out of Zeno's school. But why should not you, who would give kings a power of doing what they list, have liberty yourself to broach what new philosophy you please? Now begin again, to act your part. "There never was in any king's reign so much blood spilt, so many families ruined." All this is to be imputed to Charles, not to us, who first raised an army of Irishmen against us; who by his own warrant authorized the Irish nation to conspire against the English; who by their means slew two hundred thousand of his English subjects in the province of Ulster, besides what numbers were slain in other parts of that kingdom; who solicited two armies towards the destruction of the parliament of England, and the city of London; and did many other actions of hostility before the parliament and people had lifted one soldier for the preservation and defence of the government. What principles, what law, what religion ever taught men rather to consult their ease, to save their money, their blood, nay their lives themselves, than to oppose an enemy with force? for I make no difference between a foreign enemy and another, since both are equally dangerous and destructive to the good of the whole nation. The people of Israel saw very well, that they could not possibly punish the Benjamites for murdering the Levite's wife, without the loss of many men's lives: and did that induce them to sit still? Was that accounted a sufficient argument why they should abstain from war, from a very bloody civil war? Did they therefore suffer the death of one poor woman to be unrevenged? Certainly if nature teaches us rather to endure the government of a king, though he be never so bad,

than to endanger the lives of a great many men in the recovery of our liberty; it must teach us likewise not only to endure a kingly government, which is the only one that you argue ought to be submitted to, but even an aristocracy and a democracy: nay, and sometimes it will persuade us, to submit to a multitude of highwaymen, and to slaves that mutiny. Fulvius and Rupilius, if your principles had been received in their days, must not have engaged in the servile war (as their writers call it) after the Prætorian armies were slain: Crassus must not have marched against Sparticus, after the rebels had destroyed one Roman army, and spoiled their tents: nor must Pompey have undertaken the Pyratie war. But the state of Rome must have pursued the dictates of nature, and must have submitted to their own slaves, or to the pirates, rather than run the hazard of losing some men's lives. You do not prove at all, that nature has imprinted any such notion as this of yours on the minds of men: and yet you cannot forbear boding us ill luck, and denouncing the wrath of God against us (which may heaven divert, and inflict it upon yourself, and all such prognosticators as you) who have punished, as he deserved, one that had the name of our king, but was in fact our implacable enemy; and we have made atonement for the death of so many of our countrymen, as our civil wars have occasioned, by shedding his blood, that was the author and cause of them. Then you tell us, that a kingly government appears to be more according to the laws of nature, because "more nations, both in our days, and of old, have submitted to that form of government, than ever did to any other." I answer, if that be so, it was neither the effect of any dictate of the law of nature, nor was it in obedience to any command from God. God would not suffer his own people to be under a king; he consented at last, but unwillingly; what nature and right reason dictates, we are not to gather from the practice of most nations, but of the wisest and most prudent. The Grecians, the Romans, the Italians, and Carthaginians, with many other, have of their own accord, out of choice, preferred a commonwealth to a kingly government; and these nations that I have named, are better instances than all the rest. Hence Sulpitius Severus says, 'That the very name of a king was always very odious among a freeborn people.' But these things concern not our present purpose, nor many other impertinences that follow over and over again. I will make haste to prove that by examples, which I have proved already by reason; viz. that it is very agreeable to the law of nature, that tyrants should be punished; and that all nations, by the instinct of nature, have punished them; which will expose your impudence, and make it evident, that you take a liberty to publish palpable downright lyes. You begin with the Egyptians; and indeed, who does not see, that you play the gipsy yourself throughout? "Amongst them," say you, "there is no mention extant of any king, that was ever slain by the people in a popular insurrection, no war made upon any of their kings by their subjects, no attempt made to depose any of them." What think you then of Osiris, who perhaps was the first king that the Egyptians ever had? Was not he slain by his brother Typhon, and five and twenty other conspirators? And did not a great part of the body of the people side with them, and fight a battle with Isis and Orus, the late king's wife and son? I pass by Sesostris, whom his brother had well nigh put to death, and Chemmis and Cephrenes, against whom the people were deservedly enraged; and because they could not do it while they were alive, they threatened to tear them in pieces after they were dead. Do you think that a people that durst lay violent hands upon good kings, had any restraint upon them, either by the light of nature or religion, from putting bad ones to death? Could they that threatened to pull the dead bodies of their princes out of their graves, when they ceased to do mischief, (though by the custom of their own country, the corps of the meanest person was sacred and inviolable) abstain from inflicting punishment upon them in their life-time, when they were acting all their villanies, if they had been able; and that upon some maxim of the law of nature? I know you would not stick to answer me in the affirmative, how absurd soever it be; but that you may not offer at it, I will pull out your tongue. Know then, that some ages before Cephrenes's time, one Ammosis was king of Egypt, and was as great a tyrant, as
who

who has been the greatest; him the people bore with. This you are glad to hear; this is what you would be at. But hear what follows, my honest Tell-truth. I shall speak out of Diodorus, "They bore with him for some while, because he was too strong for them." But when Actifanes king of Ethiopia made war upon him, they took that opportunity to revolt, so that being deserted, he was easily subdued, and Egypt became an accession to the kingdom of Ethiopia. You see the Egyptians, as soon as they could, took up arms against a tyrant; they joined forces with a foreign prince, to depose their own king, and disinherit his posterity; they chose to live under a moderate and good prince, as Actifanes was, though a foreigner, rather than under a tyrant of their own. The same people with a very unanimous consent took up arms against Apries, another tyrant, who relied upon foreign aids that he had hired to assist him. Under the conduct of Amasis their general they conquered, and afterward strangled him, and placed Amasis in the throne. And observe this circumstance in the history; Amasis kept the captive king a good while in the palace, and treated him well: at last, when the people complained that he nourished his own and their enemy; he delivered him into their hands, who put him to death in the manner I have mentioned. These things are related by Herodotus and Diodorus. Where are you now? do you think that any tyrant would not chuse a Hatchet rather than a Halter? "Afterwards, say you, when the Egyptians were brought into subjection by the Persians, they continued faithful to them;" which is most false; they never were faithful to them: For in the fourth year after Cambyfes had subdued them, they rebelled. Afterwards, when Xerxes had tamed them, within a short time they revolted from his son Artaxerxes, and set up one Inarus to be their king. After his death they rebelled again, and created one Tachus king, and made war upon Artaxerxes Mnemon. Neither were they better subjects to their own princes, for they deposed Tachus, and conferred the government upon his son Nectanebus, till at last Artaxerxes Ochus brought them the second time under subjection to the Persian empire. When they were under the Macedonian empire, they declared by their actions, that tyrants ought to be under some restraint: They threw down the statues and images of Ptolemæus Physco, and would have killed him, but that the mercenary army that he commanded, was too strong for them. His son Alexander was forced to leave his country by the meer violence of the people, who were incensed against him for killing his mother. And the people of Alexandria dragged his son Alexander out of the palace, whose insolent behaviour gave just offence, and killed him in the theatre. And the same people deposed Ptolemæus Auletes for his many crimes. Now since it is impossible that any learned man should be ignorant of these things that are so generally known; and since it is an inexcusable fault in Salmasius to be ignorant of them, whose profession it is to teach them others, and whose very asserting things of this nature ought to carry in itself an argument of credibility; it is certainly a very scandalous thing (I say) either that so ignorant, illiterate a blockhead, should, to the scandal of all learning, profess himself, and be accounted a learned man, and obtain salaries from princes and states; or that so impudent and notorious a liar should not be branded with some particular mark of infamy, and for ever banished from the society of learned and honest men. Having searched among the Egyptians for examples, let us now consider the Ethiopians their neighbours. They adore their kings, whom they suppose God to have appointed over them, even as if they were a sort of Gods: And yet whenever the priests condemn any of them, they kill themselves: And on that manner, says Diodorus, they punish all their criminals; they put them not to death, but send a minister of justice to command them to destroy their own persons. In the next place, you mention the Assyrians, the Medes, and the Persians, who of all others were most observant of their princes: And you affirm, contrary to all historians that have wrote any thing concerning those nations, that "the regal power there, had an unbounded liberty annexed to it, of doing what the king listed." In the first place, the prophet Daniel tells us, how the Babylonians expelled Nebuchadnezzar out of human society, and made him graze with the beasts, when his pride grew to be insufferable. The laws of those countries were

not intitled the laws of their kings, but the laws of the Medes and Persians; which laws were irrevocable, and the kings themselves were bound by them: Insomuch that Darius the Mede, though he earnestly desired to have delivered Daniel from the hands of the princes, yet could not effect it. "Those nations," say you, "thought it no sufficient pretence to reject a prince, because he abused the right that was inherent in him as he was sovereign." But in the very writing of these words you are so stupid, as that with the same breath that you commend the obedience and submissiveness of those nations, of your own accord you make mention of Sardanapalus's being deprived of his crown by Arbaces. Neither was it he alone that accomplished that enterprize; for he had the assistance of the priests (who of all others were best versed in the law) and of the people; and it was wholly upon this account that he deposed him, because he abused his authority and power, not by giving himself over to cruelty, but to luxury and effeminacy. Run over the histories of Herodotus, Ctesias, Diodorus, and you will find things quite contrary to what you assert here; you will find that those kingdoms were destroyed for the most part by subjects, and not by foreigners; that the Assyrians were brought down by the Medes, who then were their subjects, and the Medes by the Persians, who at that time were likewise subject to them. You yourself confess, that "Cyrus rebelled, and that at the same time in divers parts of the empire little upstart governments were formed by those that shook off the Medes." But does this agree with what you said before? Does this prove the obedience of the Medes and Persians to their princes, and that *Jus Regium* which you had asserted to have been universally received amongst those nations? What potion can cure this brain-sick frenzy of yours? You say, "it appears by Herodotus how absolute the Persian kings were." Cambyfes being desirous to marry his sisters, consulted with the judges, who were the interpreters of the laws, to whose decision all difficult matters were to be referred. What answer had he from them? They told him, they knew no law which permitted a brother to marry his sister; but another law they knew, that the kings of Persia might do what they listed. Now to this I answer, if the kings of Persia were really so absolute, what need was there of any other to interpret the laws, besides the king himself? Those superfluous unnecessary judges would have had their abode and residence in any other place rather than in the palace, where they were altogether useless. Again, if those kings might do whatever they would, it is not credible that so ambitious a prince as Cambyfes was, should be so ignorant of that grand prerogative, as to consult with the judges, whether what he desired were according to law. What was the matter then? either they designed to humour the king, as you say they did, or they were afraid to cross his inclination, which is the account that Herodotus gives of it; and so told him of such a law, as they knew would please him, and in plain terms made a fool of him; which is no new thing with judges and lawyers now a-days. "But," say you, "Artabanus a Persian told Themistocles, that there was no better law in Persia, than that by which it was enacted, that kings were to be honoured and adored." An excellent law that was without doubt, which commanded subjects to adore their princes! but the primitive fathers have long ago damned it; and Artabanus was a proper person to commend such a law, who was the very man that a little while after slew Xerxes with his own hand. You quote regicides to assert royalty. I am afraid you have some design upon kings. In the next place, you quote the poet Claudian, to prove how obedient the Persians were. But I appeal to their histories and annals, which are full of the revolts of the Persians, the Medes, the Bactrians, and Babylonians, and give us frequent instances of the murders of their princes. The next person whose authority you cite, is Otanes the Persian, who likewise killed Smerdis then king of Persia, to whom, out of the hatred which he bore to a kingly government, he reckons up the impieties and injurious actions of kings, their violation of all laws, their putting men to death without any legal conviction, their rapes and adulteries; and all this you will have called the right of kings, and slander Samuel again as a teacher of such doctrines. You quote Homer, who says that kings derive their authority from Jupiter;

to which I have already given an answer. For king Philip of Macedon, whose asserting the right of kings, you make use of; I will believe Charles his description of it, as soon as his. Then you quote some sentences out of a fragment of Diogenes a Pythagorean; but you do not tell us what sort of a king he speaks of. Observe therefore how he begins that discourse; for whatever follows must be understood to have relation to it. 'Let him be king,' says he, 'that of all others is most just, and so he is that acts most according to law; for no man can be king that is not just; and without laws there can be no justice.' This is directly opposite to that regal right of yours. And Ecphantas, whom you likewise quote, is of the same opinion: 'Whosoever takes upon him to be a king, ought to be naturally most pure and clear from all imputation.' And a little after, 'Him,' says he, 'we call a king, that governs well, and he only is properly so.' So that such a king as you speak of, according to the philosophy of the Pythagoreans, is no king at all. Hear now what Plato says in his Eighth Epistle: 'Let kings,' says he, 'be liable to be called to account for what they do: Let the laws controul not only the people, but kings themselves, if they do any thing not warranted by law.' I will mention what Aristotle says in the Third Book of his Politics; 'It is neither for the public good, nor is it just,' says he, 'seeing all men are by nature alike and equal, that any one should be lord and master over all the rest, where there are no laws; nor is it for the public good, or just, that one man should be a law to the rest, where there are laws; nor that any one, though a good man, should be lord over other good men, nor a bad man over bad men.' And in the Fifth Book, says he, 'That king whom the people refuse to be governed by, is no longer a king, but a tyrant.' Hear what Xenophon says in Hiero: 'People are so far from revenging the deaths of tyrants, that they confer great honour upon him that kills one, and erect statues in their temples to the honour of tyrannicides.' Of this I can produce an eye-witness, Marcus Tullius, in his oration pro Milone; 'The Grecians,' says he, 'ascribe divine worship to such as kill tyrants: What things of this nature have I myself seen at Athens, and in the other cities of Greece? how many religious observances have been instituted in honour of such men? how many hymns? They are consecrated to immortality and adoration, and their memory endeavoured to be perpetuated.' And lastly, Polybius, a historian of great authority and gravity, in the Sixth Book of his History, says thus: 'When princes began to indulge their own lusts and sensual appetites, then kingdoms were turned into so many tyrannies, and the subjects began to conspire the death of their governors; neither was it the profligate sort that were the authors of those designs, but the most generous and magnanimous.' I could quote many such like passages, but I shall instance in no more. From the philosophers you appeal to the poets; and I am very willing to follow you thither. 'Æschylus is enough to inform us, that the power of the kings of Greece was such, as not to be liable to the censure of any laws, or to be questioned before any human judicature; for he in that tragedy that is called, The Suppliants, calls the king of the Argives, a governor not obnoxious to the judgment of any tribunal.' But you must know (for the more you say, the more you discover your rashness and want of judgment) you must know, I say, that one is not to regard what the poet says, but what person in the play speaks, and what that person says; for different persons are introduced, sometimes good, sometimes bad; sometimes wise men, sometimes fools, and such words are put into their mouths, as it is most proper for them to speak; not such as the poet would speak, if he were to speak in his own person. The fifty daughters of Danaus being banished out of Egypt, became suppliants to the king of the Argives; they begged of him, that he would protect them from the Egyptians, who pursued them with a fleet of ships. The king told them he could not undertake their protection, till he had imparted the matter to the people; 'For,' says he, 'if I should make a promise to you, I should not be able to perform it, unless I consult with them first.' The women being strangers and suppliants, and fearing the uncertain suffrages of the people, tell him, 'That the power of all the people resides

resides in him alone; that he judges all others, but is not judged himself by any.' He answers: 'I have told you already, That I cannot do this thing that you desire of me, without the people's consent; nay, and though I could, I would not.' At last he refers the matter to the people; 'I will assemble the people,' says he, 'and persuade them to protect you.' The people met, and resolved to engage in their quarrel; insomuch that Danaus their father bids his daughters, 'be of good cheer, for the people of the country, in a popular convention, had voted their safeguard and defence.' If I had not related the whole thing, how rashly would this impertinent Ignoramus have determined concerning the right of kings among the Grecians, out of the mouths of a few women that were strangers and suppliants, though the king himself, and the history be quite contrary? The same thing appears by the story of Orestes in Euripides, who after his father's death was himself king of the Argives, and yet was called in question by the people for the death of his mother, and made to plead for his life, and by the major suffrage was condemned to die. The same poet, in his play called "The Suppliants," declares, That at Athens the kingly power was subject to the laws; where Theseus then king of that city is made to say these words: 'This is a free city, it is not governed by one man; the people reigns here.' And his son Demophon, who was king after him, in another tragedy of the same poet, called *Heraclidæ*; 'I do not exercise a tyrannical power over them, as if they were Barbarians: I am upon other terms with them; but if I do them justice, they will do me the like.' Sophocles in his *Œdipus* shows, That anciently in Thebes the kings were not absolute neither: Hence says Tiresius to *Œdipus*, 'I am not your slave.' And Creon to the same king, 'I have some right in this city,' says he, 'as well as you.' And in another tragedy of the same poet, called *Antigone*, *Æmon* tells the king, 'That the city of Thebes is not governed by a single person.' All men know that the kings of Lacedæmon have been arraigned, and sometimes put to death judicially. These instances are sufficient to evince what power the kings in Greece had. Let us consider now the Romans: You betake yourself to that passage of C. Memmius in Salust, of kings having a liberty to do what they list, and go unpunished; to which I have given an answer already. Salust himself says in express words, 'That the ancient government of Rome was by their laws, though the name and form of it was regal: which form of government, when it grew into a tyranny, you know they put down and changed. Cicero, in his oration against Piso, 'Shall I,' says he, 'account him a consul, who would not allow the senate to have any authority in the commonwealth? Shall I take notice of any man as consul, if at the same time there be no such thing as a senate; when of old, the city of Rome acknowledged not their kings, if they acted without, or in opposition to the senate?' Do you hear; the very kings themselves at Rome signified nothing without the senate. "But, say you, Romulus governed as he listed;" and for that you quote Tacitus. No wonder: the government was not then established by law; they were a confused multitude of strangers, more likely than a regulated state; and all mankind lived without laws, before governments were settled. But when Romulus was dead, though all the people were desirous of a king, not having yet experienced the sweetness of liberty, yet, as Livy informs us, 'The sovereign power resided in the people; so that they parted not with more right than they retained.' The same author tells us, 'That the same power was afterwards extorted from them by their emperors.' Servius Tullius at first reigned by fraud, and as it were a deputy to Tarquinius Priscus; but afterward he referred it to the people, Whether they would have him reign or no? At last, says Tacitus, he became the author of such laws as the kings were obliged to obey. Do you think he would have done such an injury to himself and his posterity, if he had been of opinion that the right of kings had been above all laws? Their last king Tarquinius Superbus, was the first that put an end to that custom of consulting the senate concerning all public affairs: for which very thing, and other enormities of his, the people deposed him, and banished him and his family. These things

I have out of Livy and Cicero, than whom you will hardly produce any better expostors of the right of kings among the Romans. As for the dictatorship, that was but temporary, and was never made use of, but in great extremities, and was not to continue longer than six months. But that which you call the right of the Roman emperors, was no right, but a plain downright force; and was gained by war only. "But Tacitus," say you, "that lived under the government of a single person, writes thus; the Gods have committed the sovereign power in human affairs to princes only, and have left to subjects the honour of being obedient." But you tell us not where Tacitus has these words, for you were conscious to yourself, that you imposed upon your readers in quoting them; which I presently smelt out, though I could not find the place of a sudden: For that expression is not Tacitus's own, who is an approved writer, and of all others the greatest enemy to tyrants; but Tacitus relates that of M. Terentius, a gentleman of Rome, being accused for a capital crime, amongst other things that he said to save his life, flattered Tiberius on this manner. It is in the Sixth Book of his Annals. 'The gods have entrusted you with the ultimate judgment in all things; they have left us the honour of obedience.' And you cite this passage as if Tacitus had said it himself; you scrape together whatever seems to make for your opinion, either out of ostentation, or out of weakness; you would leave out nothing that you could find in a Baker's, or a Barber's shop; nay, you would be glad of any thing that looked like an argument, from the very hangman. If you had read Tacitus himself, and not transcribed some loose quotations out of him by other authors, he would have taught you whence that imperial right had its original. 'After the conquest of Asia,' says he, 'the whole state of our affairs was turned upside down; nothing of the ancient integrity of our forefathers was left amongst us; all men shook off that former equality which had been observed, and began to have reverence for the mandates of princes.' This you might have learned out of the Third Book of his Annals, whence you have all your regal right. 'When that ancient equality was laid aside, and instead thereof ambition and violence took place, tyrannical forms of government started up, and fixed themselves in many countries.' This same thing you might have learned out of Dio, if your natural levity and unsettledness of judgment would have suffered you to apprehend any thing that is solid. He tells us in the Fifty-third Book of his History, out of which book you have made some quotation already, That Octavius Cæsar, partly by force, and partly by fraud, brought things to that pass, that the emperors of Rome became no longer fettered by laws. For he, though he promised to the people in public that he would lay down the government, and obey the laws, and become subject to others; yet under pretence of making war in several provinces of the empire, still retained the legions, and so by degrees invaded the government, which he pretended he would refuse. This was not regularly getting from under the law, but breaking forcibly through all laws, as Spartacus the gladiator might have done; and then assuming to himself the style of prince or emperor, as if God or the law of nature had put all men and all laws into subjection under him. Would you enquire a little further into the original of the right of the Roman emperors? Marcus Antonius, whom Cæsar (when by taking up arms against the commonwealth, he had got all the power into his hands) had made consul, when a solemnity called the Lupercalia was celebrated at Rome, as had been contrived beforehand, that he should set a crown upon Cæsar's head, though the people sighed and lamented at the sight, caused it to be entered upon record, that Marcus Antonius, at the Lupercalia, made Cæsar king at the instance of the people. Of which action Cicero in his second Philippic says, 'was Lucius Tarquinius therefore expelled, Spurius Cassius, Sp. Melius, and Marcus Manilius put to death, that after many ages Marcus Antonius should make a king in Rome, contrary to law?' But you deserve to be tortured, and loaded with everlasting disgrace, much more than Mark Antony; tho' I would not have you proud because he and yourself are put together: for I do not think so despicable a

wretch as you fit to be compared with him in any thing but his impiety ; you that in those horrible Lupercalia of yours, set not a crown upon one tyrant's head, but upon all, and such a crown as you would have limited by no laws, nor liable to any. Indeed if we must believe the oracles of the emperors themselves, (for so some christian emperors, as Theodosius and Valens, have called their edicts, Cod. lib. 1 tit. 14.) the authority of the emperors depends upon that of the law. So that the majesty of the person that reigns, even by the judgment, or call it the oracle of the emperors themselves, must submit to the laws, on whose authority it depends. Hence Pliny tells Trajan in his Panegyric, when the power of the emperors was grown to its height, 'A principality, and an absolute sovereignty are quite different things. Trajan puts down whatever looks like a kingdom ; he rules like a prince, that there may be no room for a magisterial power.' And afterwards, 'whatever I have said of other princes, I said that I might show how our prince reforms and corrects the manners of princes, which by long custom have been corrupted and depraved.' Are not you ashamed to call that the right of kings, that Pliny calls the corrupt and depraved customs of princes ? But let this suffice to have been said in short of the right of kings, as it was taken at Rome. How they dealt with their tyrants, whether kings or emperors, is generally known. They expelled Tarquin. "But," say you, "how did they expel him ? Did they proceed against him judicially ? No such matter : When he would have come into the city, they shut the gates against him." Ridiculous fool ! what could they do but shut the gates, when he was hastening to them with part of the army ? And what great difference will there be, whether they banished him, or put him to death, so they punished him one way or other ? The best men of that age killed Cæsar the tyrant in the very senate. Which action of theirs, Marcus Tullius, who was himself a very excellent man, and publicly called the father of his country, both elsewhere and particularly in his second Philippic, extols wonderfully. I'll repeat some of his words : 'All good men killed Cæsar, as far as in them lay. Some men could not advise in it, others wanted courage to act in it, others wanted an opportunity, all had a good will to it.' And afterwards, 'what greater and more glorious action (ye holy Gods !) ever was performed, not in this city only, but in any other country ? what action more worthy to be recommended to everlasting memory ? I am not unwilling to be included within the number of those that advised it, as within the Trojan horse.' The passage of Seneca may relate both to the Romans, and the Grecians : 'there cannot be a greater, nor more acceptable sacrifice offered up to Jupiter, than a wicked prince.' For if you consider Hercules, whose words these are, they shew what the opinion was of the principal men amongst the Grecians in that age. If the poet, who flourished under Néro, (and the most worthy persons in plays generally express the poet's own sense) then this passage shows us what Seneca himself and all good men, even in Nero's time, thought was fit to be done to a tyrant ; and how virtuous an action, how acceptable to God they thought it to kill one. So every good man of Rome, as far as in him lay, killed Domitian. Pliny the second owns it openly in his Panegyric to Trajan the emperor, 'we took pleasure in dashing those proud looks against the ground, in piercing him with our swords, in mangling him with axes, as if he had bled and felt pain at every stroke : No man could so command his passion of joy, but that he counted it a piece of revenge to behold his mangled limbs, his members torn asunder, and after all, his stern and horrid statues thrown down and burnt.' And afterwards, 'they cannot love good princes enough, that cannot hate bad ones as they deserve.' Then amongst other enormities of Domitian, he reckons this for one, that he put to death Epaphroditus, that had killed Nero : 'Had we forgotten the avenging Nero's death ? Was it likely that he would suffer his life and actions to be ill spoken of, whose death he revenged ?' He seems to have thought it almost a crime not to kill Nero, that counts it so great a one to punish him that did it. By what has been said, it is evident, that the best of the Romans did not only kill tyrants, as oft as they could, and howsoever they could ; but that they thought

thought it a commendable, and a praise-worthy action so to do, as the Grecians had done before them. For when they could not proceed judicially against a tyrant in his life-time, being inferior to him in strength and power, yet after his death they did it, and condemned him by the Valerian law. For Valerius Publicola, Junius Brutus his colleague, when he saw that tyrants, being guarded with soldiers, could not be brought to a legal trial, he devised a law to make it lawful to kill them any way, tho' uncondemned; and that they that did it, should afterwards give an account of their so doing. Hence, when Cassius had actually run Caligula through with a sword, tho' every body else had done it in their hearts, Valerius Asiaticus, one that had been consul, being present at that time, cried out to the soldiers that began to mutiny because of his death, "I wish I myself had killed him." And the senate at the same time was so far from being displeased with Cassius for what he had done, that they resolved to extirpate the memory of the emperors, and to raze the temples that had been erected in honour of them. When Claudius was presently saluted emperor by the soldiers, they forbade him by the tribune of the people to take the government upon him; but the power of the soldiers prevailed. The senate declared Nero an enemy, and made enquiry after him, to have punished him according to the law of their ancestors; which required, that he should be stript naked, and hung by the neck upon a forked stake, and whipt to death. Consider now, how much more mildly and moderately the English dealt with their tyrant, tho' many are of opinion, that he caused the spilling of more blood than ever Nero himself did. So the senate condemned Domitian after his death; they commanded his statues to be pulled down and dashed in pieces, which was all they could do. When Commodus was slain by his own officers, neither the senate nor the people punished the fact, but declared him an enemy, and enquired for his dead corps to have made it an example. An act of the senate made upon that occasion is extant in Lampridius: 'Let the enemy of his country be deprived of all his titles; let the parricide be drawn, let him be torn in pieces in the Spoliary, let the enemy of the Gods, the executioner of the senate be dragged with a hook, &c.' The same persons in a very full senate condemned Didius Julianus to death, and sent a tribune to slay him in the palace. The same senate deposed Maximinus, and declared him an enemy. Let us hear the words of the decree of the senate concerning him, as Capitolinus relates it: 'The consul put the question, conscript fathers, what is your pleasure concerning the Maximines? They answered, 'They are enemies, they are enemies, whoever kills them shall be rewarded.' Would you know now, whether the people of Rome, and the provinces of the empire obeyed the senate, or Maximine the emperor? Hear what the same author says, the senate wrote letters into all the provinces, requiring them to take care of their common safety and liberty; the letters were publicly read. And the friends, the deputies, the generals, the tribunes, the soldiers of Maximine, were slain in all places; very few cities were found that kept their faith with the public enemy. Herodian relates the same thing. But what need we give any more instances out of the Roman histories? Let us now see what manner of thing the right of kings was in those days, in the nations that bordered upon the empire. Ambiorix, a king of the Gauls, confesses, 'the nature of his dominion to be such, that the people have as great power over him, as he over them.' And consequently, as well as he judged them, he might be judged by them. Vercingetorix, another king in Gaul, was accused of treason by his own people. These things Cæsar relates in his history of the Gallic wars. 'Neither is the regal power among the Germans absolute and uncontrollable; lesser matters are ordered and disposed by the princes; greater affairs by all the people. The king or prince is more considerable by the authority of his persuasions, than by any power that he has of commanding. If his opinion be not approved of, they declare their dislike of it by a general murmuring noise.' This is out of Tacitus. Nay, and you yourself now confess, that what but of late you exclaimed against as an unheard of thing, has been often done, to wit, that "no less than fifty Scottish kings have been either banished,

or imprisoned, or put to death, nay, and some of them publickly executed." Which having come to pass in our very island; why do you, as if it were your office to conceal the violent deaths of tyrants, by burying them in the dark, exclaim against it as an abominable and unheard of thing? You proceed to commend the Jews and Christians for their religious obedience even to tyrants, and to heap one lye upon another; in all which I have already confuted you. Lately you made large encomiums on the obedience of the Assyrians and Persians, and now you reckon up their rebellions; and tho' but of late you said they never had rebelled at all, now you give us a great many reasons why they rebelled so often. Then you resume the narrative of the manner of our king's death, which you had broken off long since; that if you had not taken care sufficiently to appear ridiculous, and a fool then, you may do it now. You said, "he was led through the members of his own court." What you mean by the members of the court, I would gladly know. You enumerate the calamities that the Romans underwent by changing their kingdom into a commonwealth. In which I have already shown how grossly you give yourself the lye. What was it you said when you wrote against the Jesuit? You demonstrated, that "in an Aristocracy, or a popular state, there could but be seditions and tumults, whereas under a tyrant nothing was to be looked for, but certain ruin and destruction:" And dare you now say, you vain corrupt mortal, that "those seditions were punishments inflicted upon them for banishing their kings?" Forsooth, because king Charles gave you a hundred Jacobusses, therefore the Romans shall be punished for banishing their kings. But "they that killed Julius Cæsar, did not prosper afterwards." I confess, if I would have had any tyrant spared, it should have been him. For altho' he introduced a monarchical government into a free state by force of arms, yet perhaps himself deserved a kingdom best; and yet I conceive that none of those that killed him can be said to have been punished for so doing, any more than Caius Antonius, Cicero's colleague, for destroying Catiline, who when he was afterward condemned for other crimes, says Cicero in his oration pro Flacco, "Catiline's sepulchre was adorned with flowers." For they that favoured Catiline, they rejoiced; they gave out then, that what Catiline did was just, to encrease the people's hatred against those that had cut him off. These are artifices, which wicked men make use of, to deter the best of men from punishing tyrants, and flagitious persons. I might as easily say the quite contrary, and instance in them that have killed tyrants, and prospered afterwards; if any certain inference might be drawn in such cases from the events of things. You object further, "that the English did not put their hereditary king to death in like manner, as tyrants use to be slain, but as robbers and traitors are executed." In the first place I do not, nor can any wise man understand what a crown's being hereditary should contribute to a king's crimes being unpunishable. What you ascribe to the barbarous cruelty of the English, proceeded rather from their clemency and moderation, and as such, deserves commendation; who, tho' the being a tyrant is a crime that comprehends all sorts of enormities, such as robberies, treasons, and rebellions against the whole nation, yet were contented to inflict no greater punishment upon him for being so, than they used of course to do upon any common highwayman, or ordinary traitor. You hope "some such men as Harmodius and Thrasibulus will rise up amongst us, and make expiation for the king's death, by shedding their blood that were the authors of it." But you will run mad with despair, and be detested by all good men, and put an end to that wretched life of yours, by hanging your self, before you see men like Harmodius avenging the blood of a tyrant upon such as have done no other than what they did themselves. That you will come to such an end is most probable, nor can any other be expected of so great a rogue; but the other thing is an utter impossibility. You mention thirty tyrants that rebelled in Gallienus's time. And what if it fall out, that one tyrant happens to oppose another, must therefore all they that resist tyrants be accounted such themselves? You cannot persuade men into such a belief, you slave of a knight; nor your author

Trebellius Pollio, the most inconsiderable of all historians that have writ. "If any of the emperors were declared enemies by the senate," you say, "it was done by faction, but could not have been by law." You put us in mind what it was that made emperors at first: It was faction and violence, and to speak plainer, it was the madness of Antony, that made generals at first rebel against the senate, and the people of Rome; there was no law, no right for their so doing. "Galba," you say, "was punished for his insurrection against Nero." Tell us likewise how Vespasian was punished for taking up arms against Vitellius. "There was as much difference," you say, "betwixt Charles and Nero, as betwixt those English butchers, and the Roman senators of that age." Despicable villain! by whom it is scandalous to be commended, and a praise to be evil spoken of: But a few periods before, discoursing of this very thing, you said, "that the Roman senate under the emperors, was in effect but an assembly of slaves in robes:" And here you say, "that very senate was an assembly of kings;" which if it be allowed, then are kings, according to your own opinion, but slaves with robes on. Kings are blessed, that have such a fellow as you to write in their praise, than whom no man is more a rascal, no beast more void of sense, unless this one may be said to be peculiar to you, that none ever brayed so learnedly. You make the parliament of England more like to Nero, than to the Roman senate. This itch of yours of making silly similitudes, enforces me to rectify you, whether I will or no: And I will let you see how like king Charles was to Nero; Nero, you say, "commanded his own mother to be run through with a sword." But Charles murdered both his prince, and his father, and that by poison. For to omit other evidences; he that would not suffer a duke that was accused for it, to come to his trial, must needs have been guilty of it himself. Nero slew many thousands of christians; but Charles slew many more. There were those, says Suetonius, that praised Nero after he was dead, that longed to have had him again, "that hung garlands of flowers upon his sepulchre," and gave out that they would never prosper that had been his enemies. And some there are transported with the like phrensy, that wish for king Charles again, and extol him to the highest degree imaginable, of whom you a knight of the halter are a ringleader. "The English soldiers more savage than their own mastiffs, erected a new and unheard-of court of justice." Observe this ingenious symbol, or adage of Salmasius, which he has now repeated six times over, "more savage than their own mastiffs." Take notice, orators and school-masters; pluck, if you are wise, this elegant flower, which Salmasius is so very fond of: Commit this flourish of a man, that is so much a master of words, to your desks for safe custody, lest it be lost. Has your rage made you forget words to that degree, that like a cuckoo, you must needs say the same thing over and over again? What strange thing has befallen you? The poet tells us, that spleen and rage turned Hecuba into a dog; and it has turned you, the lord of St. Lupus, into a cuckoo. Now you come out with fresh contradictions. You had said before, pag. 113. that "princes were not bound by any laws, neither coercive, nor directory; that they were bound by no law at all." Now you say, that "you will discourse by and by of the difference betwixt some kings and others, in point of power; some having had more, some less." You say, "you will prove that kings cannot be judged, nor condemned by their own subjects, by a most solid argument;" but you do it by a very silly one, and it is this: You say, "There was no other difference than that betwixt the judges, and the kings of the Jews; and yet the reason why the Jews required to have kings over them, was because they were weary of their judges, and hated their government." Do you think, that, because they might judge and condemn their judges, if they misbehaved themselves in the government, they therefore hated and were weary of them, and would be under kings, whom they should have no power to restrain and keep within bounds, tho' they should break through all laws? Who but you ever argued so childishly? So that they desired a king for some other reason, than that they might have a master over them, whose power should be superior to that of the law; which reason,

reason, what it was, it is not to our present purpose to make a conjecture. Whatever it was, both God and his prophets tell us, it was no piece of prudence in the people to desire a king. And now you fall foul upon your Rabbins, and are very angry with them for saying, that a king might be judged and condemned to undergo stripes; out of whose writings you said before you had proved that the kings of the Jews could not be judged. Wherein you confess, that you told a lye when you said you had proved any such thing out of their writings. Nay, you come at last to forget the subject you were upon, of writing in the king's defence, and raise little impertinent controversies about Solomon's stables, and how many stalls he had for his horses. Then of a jockey you become a ballad-singer again, or rather, as I said before, a raving distracted cuckoo. You complain, that in these latter ages, discipline has been more remiss, and the rule less observed and kept up to; viz. because one tyrant is not permitted, without a check from the law, to let loose the reins of all discipline, and corrupt all mens manners. This doctrine, you say, the Brownists introduced amongst those of the reformed religion; so that Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Bucer, and all the most celebrated orthodox divines are Brownists in your opinion. The English have the less reason to take your reproaches ill, because they hear you belching out the same slanders against the most eminent doctors of the Church, and in effect against the whole reformed Church itself.

C H A P. VI.

AFTER having discoursed upon the law of God and of nature, and handled both so untowardly, that you have got nothing by the bargain but a deserved reproach of ignorance and knavery; I cannot apprehend what you can have farther to alledge in defence of your royal cause, but mere trifles. I for my part, hope I have given satisfaction already to all good and learned men, and done this noble cause right, should I break off here; yet lest I should seem to any to decline your variety of arguing and ingenuity, rather than your immoderate impertinence, and tittle-tattle, I'll follow you wherever you have a mind to go; but with such brevity as shall make it appear, that after having performed whatever the necessary defence of the cause required, if not what the dignity of it merited, I now do but comply with some men's expectation, if not their curiosity. "Now," say you, "I shall alledge other and greater arguments." What! greater arguments than what the law of God and nature afforded? Help Lucina! the mountain Salmasius is in labour! It is not for nothing that he has got a she-husband. Mortals expect some extraordinary birth. "If he that is, and is called a king, might be accused before any other power, that power must of necessity be greater than that of the king; and if so, then must that power be indeed the kingly power, and ought to have the name of it: For a kingly power is thus defined; to wit, the supreme power in the state residing in a single person, and which has no superior." O ridiculous birth! a mouse crept out of the mountain! help grammarians! one of your number is in danger of perishing! the law of God and of nature are safe; but Salmasius's dictionary is undone. What if I should answer you thus? That words ought to give place to things; that we having taken away kingly government itself, do not think ourselves concerned about its name, and definition; let others look to that, who are in love with kings: We are contented with the enjoyment of our liberty; such an answer would be good enough for you. But to let you see that I deal fairly with you throughout, I will answer you, not only from my own, but from the opinion of very wise and good men, who have thought that the name and power of a king are very consistent with a power in the people and the law, superior to that of the king himself. In the first place Lycurgus, a man very eminent for wisdom, designing, as Plato says, to secure a kingly government as well as it was possible, could find no better expedient to preserve it, than by making the power of the senate,

senate, and of the Ephori, that is, the power of the people, superior to it. Theseus, in Euripides, king of Athens, was of the same opinion; for he to his great honour restored the people to their liberty, and advanced the power of the people above that of the king, and yet left the regal power in that city to his posterity. Whence Euripides in his play called the "Suppliants," introduces him speaking on this manner: 'I have advanced the people themselves into the throne, having freed the city from slavery, and admitted the people to a share in the government, by giving them an equal right of suffrage.' And in another place to the herald of Thebes, 'in the first place,' says he, 'you begin your speech, friend, with a thing that is not true, in styling me a monarch: for this city is not governed by a single person, but is a free state; the people reigns here.' These were his words, when at the same time he was both called, and really was king there. The divine Plato likewise, in his eighth epistle, "Lycurgus," says he, "introduced the power of the senate and of the Ephori, a thing very preservative of kingly government, which by this means has honourably flourished for so many ages, because the law in effect was made king. Now the law cannot be king, unless there be some, who, if there should be occasion, may put the law in execution against the king. A kingly government so bounded and limited, he himself commends to the Sicilians: 'Let the people enjoy their liberty under a kingly government; let the king himself be accountable; let the law take place even against kings themselves, if they act contrary to law.' Aristotle likewise, in the third book of his Politics, 'of all kingdoms,' says he, 'that are governed by laws, that of the Lacedemonians seems to be most truly and properly so.' And he says, all forms of kingly governments are according to settled and established laws, but one, which he calls *παρβασιλεία*, or Absolute Monarchy, which he does not mention ever to have obtained in any nation. So that Aristotle thought such a kingdom, as that of the Lacedemonians was, to be and deserve the name of a kingdom more properly than any other; and consequently that a king, tho' subordinate to his own people, was nevertheless actually a king, and properly so called. Now since so many and so great authors assert that a kingly government both in name and thing may very well subsist even where the people, tho' they do not ordinarily exercise the supreme power, yet have it actually residing in them, and exercise it upon occasion; be not you of so mean a soul as to fear the downfall of grammar, and the confusion of the signification of words to that degree, as to betray the liberty of mankind, and the state, rather than your glossary should not hold water. And know for the future, that words must be conformable to things, not things to words. By this means you'll have more wit, and not run on in infinitum, which now you are afraid of. "It was to no purpose then for Seneca," you say, "to describe those three forms of government, as he has done." Let Seneca do a thing to no purpose, so we enjoy our liberty. And if I mistake us not, we are other sort of men than to be enslaved by Seneca's flowers. And yet Seneca, tho' he says that the sovereign power in a kingly government resides in a single person, says withal that "the power is the people's," and by them committed to the king for the welfare of the whole, not for their ruin and destruction; and that the people has not given him a propriety in it, but the use of it. "Kings at this rate," you say, "do not reign by God but by the people." As if God did not so over-rule the people, that they set up such kings, as it pleases God. Since Justinian himself openly acknowledges, that the Roman emperors derived their authority from that "royal law, whereby the people granted to them and vested in them all their own power and authority." But how oft shall we repeat these things over and over again? Then you take upon you to intermeddle with the constitution of our government, in which you are no way concerned, who are both a stranger and a foreigner; but it shows your sauciness, and want of good manners. Come then, let us hear your solœcisms, like a busy coxcomb as you are. You tell us, but it is in false Latin, "that what those desperadoes say, is only to deceive the people." You rascal! was it not for this that you a renegado grammarian, were so forward to intermeddle

meddle with the affairs of our government, that you might introduce your solœcisms and barbarisms amongst us? But say, how have we deceived the people? "The form of government which they have set up, is not popular, but military." This is what that herd of fugitives and vagabonds hired you to write. So that I shall not trouble myself to answer you, who bleat what you know nothing of, but I'll answer them that hired you. "Who excluded the lords from parliament, was it the people?" Ay, it was the people; and in so doing they threw an intolerable yoke of slavery from off their necks. Those very soldiers, who you say did it, were not foreigners, but our own countrymen, and a great part of the people; and they did it with the consent, and at the desire of almost all the rest of the people, and not without the authority of the parliament neither. "Was it the people that cut off part of the house of commons, forcing some away? &c." Yes, I say, it was the people. For whatever the better and sounder part of the senate did, in which the true power of the people resided, why may not the people be said to have done it? What if the greater part of the senate should chuse to be slaves, or to expose the government to sale, ought not the lesser number to interpose, and endeavour to retain their liberty, if it be in their power? "But the officers of the army and their soldiers did it." And we are beholden to those officers for not being wanting to the state, but repelling the tumultuary violence of the citizens and mechanics of London, who, like that rabble that appeared for Clodius, had but a little before beset the very parliament-house? Do you therefore call the right of the parliament, to whom it properly and originally belongs, to take care of the liberty of the people both in peace and war, a military power? But it is no wonder that those traitors that have dictated these passages to you, should talk at that rate; so that profligate faction of Antony and his adherents used to call the senate of Rome, when they armed themselves against the enemies of their country, The camp of Pompey. And now I am glad to understand that they of your party envy Cromwell, that most valiant general of our army, for undertaking that expedition in Ireland, (so acceptable to Almighty God) surrounded with a joyful crowd of his friends, and prosecuted with the well-wishes of the people, and the prayers of all good men: For I question not but at the news of his many victories there, they are by this time burst with spleen. I pass by many of your impertinencies concerning the Roman Soldiers. What follows is most notoriously false: "The power of the people," say you, "ceases where there is a king." By what law or right is that? Since it is known that almost all kings, of what nations soever, received their authority from the people upon certain conditions; which if the king do not perform, I wish you would inform us, why that power, which was but a trust, should not return to the people, as well from a king, as from a consul, or any other magistrate. For when you tell us, that it is necessary for the public safety, you do but trifle with us; for the safety of the public is equally concerned, whether it be from a King, or from a Senate, or from a Triumvirate, that the power wherewith they were entrusted, reverts to the people, upon their abuse of it; and yet you yourself grant that it may so revert from all sorts of magistrates, a king only excepted. Certainly, if no people in their right wits ever committed the government either to a king, or other magistrates, for any other purpose than for the common good of them all, there can be no reason why, to prevent the utter ruin of them all, they may not as well take it back again from a king, as from other governors; nay, and it may with far greater ease be taken from one, than from many. And to invest any mortal creature with a power over themselves, on any other terms than upon trust, were extreme madness; nor is it credible that any people since the creation of the world, who had freedom of will, were ever so miserably silly, as either to part with the power for ever, and to all purposes, or to revoke it from those whom they had entrusted with it, but upon most urgent and weighty reasons. If dissensions, if civil wars, are occasioned thereby, there cannot any right accrue from thence to the king, to retain that power by force of arms, which the people challenge from him as their own. Whence it follows, that what you say, and we do not deny, that "governors are not likely to be changed," is true with

with respect to the people's prudence, not the king's right; but that therefore they ought never to be changed, upon no occasion whatsoever, that does not follow by no means; nor have you hitherto alledged any thing, or made appear any right of kings to the contrary, but that all the people concurring, they may lawfully be deposed, when unfit for government; provided it may be done, as it has been often done in your own country of France, without any tumults or civil wars. Since therefore the safety of the people, and not that of a tyrant, is the supreme law; and consequently ought to be alledged on the people's behalf against a tyrant, and not for him against them: you that go about to pervert so sacred and so glorious a law, with your fallacies and jugglings; you who would have this supreme law, and which of all others is most beneficial to mankind, to serve only for the impunity of tyrants; let me tell you (since you call us Englishmen so often inspired, and Enthusiasts, and Prophets) let me, I say, be so far a prophet, as to tell you, that the vengeance of God and man hangs over your head for so horrid a crime; although your subjecting all mankind to tyranny, as far as in you lies, which in effect is no better than condemning them to be devoured by wild beasts, is in itself part of its own vengeance; and whithersoever you fly, and wheresoever you wander, will first or last pursue you with its furies, and overtake you, and cause you to rave worse than you do at present. I come now to your second argument, which is not unlike the first: If the people may resume their liberty, "there would be no difference," say you, "betwixt a popular state and a kingdom; but that in a kingdom one man rules, and in a popular state many." And what if that were true; would the state have any prejudice by it? But you yourself tell us of other differences that would be notwithstanding; to wit, of "Time and Succession; for in popular states, the magistrates are generally chosen yearly;" whereas kings, if they behave themselves well, are perpetual; and in most kingdoms there is a succession in the same family. But let them differ from one another, or not differ, I regard not those petty things: In this they agree, that when the public good requires it, the people may, without doing injury to any, resume that power for the public safety, which they committed to another for that end and purpose. "But according to the royal law, by the Romans so called, which is mentioned in the institutes, the people of Rome granted all their power and authority to the prince." They did so by compulsion; the emperor being willing to ratify their tyranny by the authority of a law. But of this we have spoken before; and their own lawyers, commenting upon this place in the institutes, confess as much. So that we make no question but the people may revoke what they were forced to grant, and granted against their wills. But most rational it is to suppose, that the people of Rome transferred no other power to the prince, than they had before granted to their own magistrates; and that was a power to govern according to law, and a revocable, not an absurd, tyrannical power. Hence it was, that the emperors assumed the consular dignity, and that of the tribunes of the people; but after Julius Cæsar, not one of them pretended to the dictatorship: In the Circus Maximus they used to adore the people, as I have said already out of Tacitus and Claudian. But "as heretofore many private persons have sold themselves into slavery, so a whole nation may." Thou goal-bird of a knight, thou day-spirit, thou everlasting scandal to thy native country! The most despicable slaves in the world ought to abhor and spit upon such a factor for slavery, such a public pander as thou art. Certainly if people had so enslaved themselves to kings, then might kings turn them over to other masters, or sell them for money, and yet we know that kings cannot so much as alienate the demesnes of the crown: And shall he, that has but the crown, and the revenues that belong to it, as an usufructuary, and those given him by the people, can he be said to have, as it were, purchased the people, and made them his propriety? Though you were bored through both ears, and went barefoot, you would not be so vile and despicable, so much more contemptible than all slaves, as the broaching such a scandalous doctrine as this makes you. But go on, and punish yourself for your rogueries as now you do, though against your will. You frame a long discourse of the law of war; which is no-

thing to the purpose in this place : For neither did Charles conquer us ; and for his ancestors, if it were never so much granted that they did, yet have they often renounced their title as conquerors. And certain it is, That we were never so conquered, but that as we swore allegiance to them, so they swore to maintain our laws, and govern by them : Which laws, when Charles had notoriously violated, taken in what capacity you will, as one who had formerly been a conqueror or was now a perjured king, we subdued him by force, he himself having begun with us first. And according to your own opinion, " Whatever is acquired by war, becomes his property that acquired it." So that how full soever you are of words, how impertinent soever a babbler, whatever you prate, how great a noise soever you make, what quotations soever out of the Rabbins, though you make yourself never so hoarse, to the end of this chapter, assure yourself, That nothing of it makes for the king, he being now conquered, but all for us, who by God's assistance are conquerors.

C H A P. VII.

TO avoid two very great inconveniencies, and, considering your own weight, very weighty ones indeed, you denied in the foregoing chapter, that the people's power was superior to that of the king ; for if that should be granted, kings must provide themselves of some other name, because the people would indeed be king, and some divisions in your system of politics would be confounded : the first of which inconveniencies would thwart with your dictionary, and the latter overthrow your politics. To these I have given such an answer as shows, that though our own safety and liberty were the principal things I aimed the preservation of, yet withal, I had some consideration of salving your dictionary, and your politics. " Now," say you, " I will prove by other arguments, That a king cannot be judged by his own subjects ; of which arguments this shall be the greatest and most convincing, that a king has no peer in his kingdom." What ? Can a king have no peer in his kingdom ? What then is the meaning of those twelve ancient peers of the kings of France ? Are they fables and trifles ? Are they called so in vain, and in mock only ? Have a care how you affront those principal men of that kingdom : Who if they are not the king's peers, as they are called, I am afraid your dictionary, which is the only thing you are concerned for, will be found more faulty in France, than in England. But go to, let's hear your demonstration, that a king has no peer in his own kingdom. " Because," say you, " the people of Rome, when they had banished their king, appointed not one, but two consuls ; and the reason was, That if one of them should transgress the laws, his colleague might be a check to him." There could hardly have been devised any thing more silly : How came it to pass then, that but one of the consuls had the bundles of rods carried before him, and not both, if two were appointed, that each might have a power over the other ? And what if both had conspired against the commonwealth ? Would not the case then be the very same that it would have been, if one consul only had been appointed without a colleague ? But we know very well, that both consuls, and all other magistrates were bound to obey the senate, whenever the senate and the people saw, that the interest of the commonwealth so required. We have a famous instance of that in the Decemvirs, who though they were invested with the power of consuls, and were the chief magistrates, yet the authority of the senate reduced them all, though they struggled to retain their government. Nay, we read that some consuls before they were out of office, have been declared enemies, and arms been taken up against them ; for in those days no man looked upon him as a consul, who acted as an enemy. So war was waged against Antony, though a consul, by authority of the senate ; in which being worsted, he would have been put to death, but that Octavius, affecting the empire, sided with him

him to subvert the commonwealth. Now whereas you say, "That it is a property peculiar to kingly majesty, that the power resides in a single person; that is but a loose expression, like the rest of what you say, and is contradicted by yourself a little after: "For the Hebrew judges," you say, "ruled as long as they lived, and there was but one of them at a time: The scripture also calls them kings; and yet they were accountable to the great council." Thus we see, that an itch of vain-glory, in being thought to have said all that can be said, makes you hardly say any thing but contradictions. Then I ask, what kind of government that was in the Roman empire, when sometimes two, sometimes three emperors, reigned all at once? Do you reckon them to have been emperors, that is, kings, or was it an Aristocracy, or a Triumvirate? Or will you deny, that the Roman empire under Antoninus and Verus, under Dioclesian and Maximian, under Constantine and Licinius, was still but one entire empire? If these princes were not kings, your three forms of government will hardly hold; if they were, then it is not an essential property of a kingly government, to reside in a single person. "If one of these offend," say you, "then may the other refer the matter to the senate, or the people, where he may be accused and condemned." And does not the senate and the people then judge, when the matter is so referred to them? So that if you will give any credit to yourself, there needs not one colleague to judge another. Such a miserable advocate as you, if you were not so wretched a fellow as you are, would deserve compassion; you lie every way so open to blows, that if one were minded for sport's-sake to make a pass at any part of you, he could hardly miss, let him aim where he would. "It is ridiculous," say you, "to imagine, That a king will ever appoint judges to condemn himself." But I can tell you of an emperor, that was no ridiculous person, but an excellent prince, and that was Trajan, who when he delivered a dagger to a certain Roman magistrate, as the custom was, that being the badge of his office, frequently thus admonished him, 'Take this sword, and use it for me, if I do as I ought; if otherwise, against me: for miscarriages in the supreme magistrate are less excusable.' This Dion and Aurelius Victor say of him: You see here, that a worthy emperor appointed one to judge himself, though he did not make him equal. Tiberius perhaps might have said as much out of vanity and hypocrisy; but it is almost a crime to imagine that so good and virtuous a prince as Trajan, did not really speak as he thought, and according to what he apprehended right and just. How much more reasonable was it that though he were superior to the senate in power, and might if he would, have refused to yield them any obedience, yet he actually did obey them, as by virtue of his office he ought to do, and acknowledged their right in the government to be superior to his own? For so Pliny tells us in his Panegyric, 'The senate both desired and commanded you to be consul a fourth time; you may know by the obedience you pay them, that this is no word of flattery, but of power.' And a little after, 'This is the design you aim at, to restore our lost liberty.' And Trajan was not of that mind alone; the senate thought so too, and were of opinion, That their authority was indeed supreme: For they that could command their emperor, might judge him. So the emperor Marcus Aurelius, when Cassius governor of Syria endeavoured to get the empire from him, referred himself either to the senate, or the people of Rome, and declared himself ready to lay down the government, if they would have it so. Now how should a man determine of the right of kings better, and more truly, than out of the very mouths of the best of kings? Indeed every good king accounts either the senate, or the people, not only equal, but superior to himself by the law of nature. But a tyrant being by nature inferior to all men, every one that is stronger than he, ought to be accounted not only his equal, but superior: For as heretofore nature taught men from force and violence to betake themselves to laws; so wherever the laws are set at naught, the same dictate of nature must necessarily prompt us to betake ourselves to force again. 'To be of this opinion,' says 'Cicero pro Sestio,' is a sign of wisdom; to put it in practice, argues courage and resolution; and to do both, is the effect

effect of virtue in its perfection.' Let this stand then as a settled maxim of the law of nature, never to be shaken by any artifices of flatterers, That the senate, or the people, are superior to kings, be they good or bad : which is but what you yourself do in effect confess, when you tell us, That the authority of kings was derived from the people. For that power which they transferred to princes, doth yet naturally, or, as I may say, virtually reside in themselves notwithstanding : for so natural causes that produce any effect by a certain eminency of operation, do always retain more of their own virtue and energy than they impart ; nor do they by communicating to others, exhaust themselves. You see, the closer we keep to nature, the more evidently does the people's power appear to be above that of the prince. And this is likewise certain, That the people do not freely, and of choice, settle the government in the king absolutely, so as to give him a propriety in it, nor by nature can do so ; but only for the public safety and liberty, which, when the king ceases to take care of, then the people in effect have given him nothing at all : for nature says, the people gave it him to a particular end and purpose ; which end, if neither nature, nor the people can attain, the people's gift becomes no more valid, than any other void covenant or agreement. These reasons prove very fully, That the people are superior to the king ; and so your " greatest and most convincing argument, That a king cannot be judged by his people, because he has no peer in his kingdom, nor any superior, falls to the ground. For you take that for granted, which we by no means allow. " In a popular state," say you, " the magistrates being appointed by the people, may likewise be punished for their crimes by the people : in an aristocracy the senators may be punished by their Collegues : but it is a prodigious thing to proceed criminally against a king in his own kingdom, and make him plead for his life." What can you conclude from hence, but that they who set up kings over them, are the most miserable and most silly people in the world ? But, I pray, what is the reason why the people may not punish a king that becomes a malefactor, as well as they may popular magistrates and senators in an aristocracy ? Do you think that all they who live under a kingly government, were so strangely in love with slavery, as when they might be free, to chuse vassalage, and to put themselves all and intirely under the dominion of one man, who often happens to be an ill man, and often a fool, so as whatever cause might be, to leave themselves no refuge in, no relief from the laws nor the dictates of nature, against the tyranny of a most outrageous master, when such a one happens ? Why do they then tender conditions to their kings, when they first enter upon their government, and prescribe laws for them to govern by ? Do they do this to be trampled upon the more, and be the more laughed to scorn ? Can it be imagined, that a whole people would ever so vilify themselves, depart from their own interest to that degree, be so wanting to themselves, as to place all their hopes in one man, and he very often the most vain person of them all ? To what end do they require an oath of their kings, not to act any thing contrary to law ? We must suppose them to do this, that (poor creatures !) they may learn to their sorrow, That kings only may commit perjury with impunity. This is what your own wicked conclusions hold forth. " If a king that is elected, promise any thing to his people upon oath, which, if he would not have sworn to, perhaps they would not have chose him, yet if he refuse to perform that promise, he falls not under the people's censure. Nay, though he swear to his subjects at his election, That he will administer justice to them according to the laws of the kingdom ; and that if he do not, they shall be discharged of their allegiance, and himself ipso facto cease to be their king, yet if he break this oath, it is God and not man that must require it of him." I have transcribed these lines, not for their elegance, for they are barbarously expressed ; nor because I think there needs any answer to them, for they answer themselves, they explode and damn themselves by their notorious falshood and loathsomeness : but I did it to recommend you to kings for your great merits ; that among so many places as there are at court, they may put you into some preferment or office that may be fit for you. Some are princes secretaries, some their cupbearers, some masters of the revels : I

think you had best be master of the perjuries to some of them. You shall not be master of the ceremonies, you are too much a clown for that; but their treachery and perfidiousness shall be under your care. But that men may see that you are both a fool and a knave to the highest degree, let us consider these last assertions of yours a little more narrowly; "A king," say you, "though he swear to his subjects at his election, that he will govern according to law," and that if he do not, "they shall be discharged of their allegiance, and he himself ipso facto cease to be their king: yet can he not be deposed or punished by them." Why not a king, I pray, as well as popular magistrates? because in a popular state, the people do not transfer all their power to the magistrates. And do they in the case that you have put, vest it all in the king, when they place him in the government upon those terms expressly, to hold it no longer than he uses it well? Therefore it is evident, that a king sworn to observe the laws, if he transgresses them, may be punished and deposed, as well as popular magistrates. So that you can make no more use of that invincible argument of the people's transferring all their right and power to the prince; you yourself have battered it down with your own engines. Hear now another most powerful and invincible argument of his, why subjects cannot judge their kings, "because he is bound by no law, being himself the sole lawgiver." Which having been proved already to be most false, this great reason comes to nothing, as well as the former. But the reason why princes have but seldom been proceeded against for personal and private crimes, as whoredom, and adultery, and the like, is not because they could not justly be punished even for such, but lest the people should receive more prejudice through disturbances that might be occasioned by the king's death, and the change of affairs, than they would be profited by the punishment of one man or two. But when they begin to be universally injurious and insufferable, it has always been the opinion of all nations, that then, being tyrants, it is lawful to put them to death any how, condemned or uncondemned. Hence Cicero, in his Second Philippic, says thus of those that killed Cæsar, "They were the first that ran through with their swords, not a man who affected to be king, but who was actually settled in the government; which, as it was a worthy and godlike action, so it is set before us for our imitation." How unlike are you to him! "Murder, adultery, injuries, are not regal and public, but private and personal crimes." Well said, parasite! you have obliged all pimps and profligates in courts by this expression. How ingeniously do you act, both the parasite, and the pimp, with the same breath? "A king that is an adulterer, or a murderer, may yet govern well, and consequently ought not to be put to death, because, together with his life, he must lose his kingdom; and it was never yet allowed by God's laws, or man's, that for one and the same crime, a man was to be punished twice." Infamous foul-mouth wretch! By the same reason the magistrates in a popular state, or in an Aristocracy, ought never to be put to death, for fear of double punishment; no judge, no senator must die, for they must lose their magistracy too, as well as their lives. As you have endeavoured to take all power out of the people's hands, and vest it in the king, so you would all majesty too: A delegated translatitious majesty we allow, but that majesty does chiefly and primarily reside in him, you can no more prove, than you can, that power and authority does. "A king," you say, cannot commit treason against his people, but a people may against their king." And yet a king is what he is for the people only, not the people for him. Hence I infer, that the whole body of the people, or the greater part of them, must needs have greater power than the king. This you deny, and begin to cast up accounts. "He is of greater power than any one, than any two, than any three, than any ten, than any hundred, than any thousand, than any ten thousand:" Be it so, "he is of more power than half the people." I will not deny that neither; "Add now half of the other half, will he not have more power than all those?" Not at all. Go on, why do you take away the board? Do you not understand progression in arithmetic? He begins to reckon after another manner. "Has not the king, and the nobility together, more power?" No, Mr. Changeling, I deny that too.

If

If by the nobility, whom you stile Optimates, you mean the peers only; for it may happen, that amongst the whole number of them, there may not be one man deserving that appellation: for it often falls out, that there are better and wiser men than they amongst the commons, whom in conjunction with the greater, or the better part of the people, I should not scruple to call by the name of, and take them for all the people. "But if the king is not superior in power to all the people together, he is then a king but of single persons, he is not the king of the whole body of the people." You say well, no more he is, unless they are content he should be so. Now, ballance your accounts, and you will find that by miscasting, you have lost your principal. "The English say, that the right of majesty originally and principally resides in the people; which principle would introduce a confusion of all states." What, of an Aristocracy and Democracy? But let that pass. What if it should overthrow a Gynæocracy too? (i. e. a government of one or more women) under which state, or form of government, they say, you are in danger of being beaten at home; would not the English do you a kindness in that, you sheepish fellow, you? But there is no hope of that. For it is most justly so ordered, since you would subject all mankind to tyranny abroad, that you yourself should live in a scandalous most unmanlike slavery at home. "We must tell you," you say, "what we mean by the word People." There are a great many other things, which you stand more in need of being told: for of things that more immediately concern you, you seem altogether ignorant, and never to have learnt any thing but words and letters, nor to be capable of any thing else. But this you think you know, that by the word people, we mean the common people only, exclusive of the nobility, because we have put down the House of Lords. And yet that very thing shews, that under the word people we comprehend all our natives, of what order and degree soever; in that we have settled one supreme senate only, in which the nobility also, as a part of the people (not in their own right, as they did before; but representing those boroughs or counties, for which they may be chose) may give their votes. Then you inveigh against the common people, as being "blind and brutish, ignorant of the art of governing;" you say there is "nothing more empty, more vain, more inconstant, more uncertain than they." All which is very true of yourself, and it is true likewise of the rabble, but not of the middle sort, amongst whom the most prudent men, and most skilful in affairs, are generally found; others are most commonly diverted either by luxury and plenty, or by want and poverty, from virtue, and the study of laws and government. "There are many ways," you say, "by which kings come to the crown, so as not to be beholden to the people at all for it;" and especially, "those that inherit a kingdom." But those nations must certainly be slaves, and born to slavery, that acknowledge any one to be their lord and master so absolutely, as that they are his inheritance, and come to him by descent, without any consent of their own; they deserve not the appellation of subjects, nor of freemen, nor can they justly be reputed such; nor are they to be accounted as a civil society, but must be looked on as the possessions and estate of their lord, and his family: for I see no difference as to the right of ownership betwixt them, and slaves, or beasts. Secondly, "They that come to the crown by conquest, cannot acknowledge themselves to have received from the people the power they usurp." We are not now discoursing of a conqueror, but of a conquered king; what a conqueror may lawfully do, we will discourse elsewhere; do you keep to your subject. But whereas you ascribe to kings that ancient right that masters of families have over their households, and take an example from thence of their absolute power; I have shown already over and over, that there is no likeness at all betwixt them. And Aristotle (whom you name so often) if you had read him, would have taught you as much in the beginning of his politics, where he says they judge amiss that think there is but little difference betwixt a king, and a master of a family: "For that there is not a numerical, but a specifical difference betwixt a kingdom and a family." For when villages grew to be towns and cities, that regal domestic right vanished by degrees, and was no more owned. Hence Diodorus, in his first book,

book, says, That anciently kingdoms were transmitted not to the former kings sons, but to those that had best deserved of the people. And Justin, 'Originally,' says he, 'the government of nations, and of countries, was by kings, who were exalted to that height of majesty, not by popular ambition, but for their moderation, which commended them to good men.' Whence it is manifest, that, in the very beginning of nations, that fatherly and hereditary government gave way to virtue, and the people's right: which is the most natural reason and cause, and was the true rise of kingly government. For at first, men entered into societies, not that any one might insult over all the rest, but that in case any should injure another, there might be laws and judges to protect them from wrong, or at least to punish the wrong doers. When men were at first dispersed and scattered asunder, some wise and eloquent man persuaded them to enter into civil societies; "that he himself," say you, "might exercise dominion over them, when so united." Perhaps you meant this of Nimrod, who is said to have been the first tyrant. Or else it proceeds from your own malice only, and certainly it cannot have been true of those great and generous spirited men, but is a fiction of your own, not warranted by any authority that I ever heard of. For all ancient writers tell us, that those first institutors of communities of men, had a regard to the good and safety of mankind only, and not to any private advantages of their own, or to make themselves great or powerful. One thing cannot pass by, which I suppose you intended for an emblem, to set off the rest of this chapter: "If a consul," say you, "had been to be accused before his magistracy expired, there must have been a dictator created for that purpose;" though you had said before, "that for that very reason there were two of them." Just so your positions always agree with one another, and almost every page declares how weak and frivolous whatever you say or write upon any subject, is. "Under the ancient Saxon kings," you say, "the people were never called to parliaments." If any of our own countrymen had asserted such a thing, I could easily have convinced him that he was in an error. But I am not so much concerned at your mistaking our affairs, because you are a foreigner. This in effect is all you say of the right of kings in general. Many other things I omit, for you use many digressions, and put things down that either have no ground at all, or are nothing to the purpose, and my design is not to vie with you in impertinence.

C H A P. VIII.

IF you had published your own opinion, Salmasius, concerning the right of kings in general, without affronting any persons in particular, notwithstanding this alteration of affairs in England, as long as you did but use your own liberty in writing what yourself thought fit, no Englishman could have had any cause to have been displeased with you, nor would you have made good the opinion you maintain ever a whit the less. For if it be a positive command both of Moses and of Christ himself, "That all men whatsoever, whether Spaniards, French, Italians, Germans, English, or Scots, should be subject to their princes, be they good or bad," which you asserted, p. 127. to what purpose was it for you, who are a foreigner, and unknown to us, to be tampering with our laws, and to read us lectures out of them as out of your own papers and miscellanies, which, be they how they will, you have taught us already in a great many words, that they ought to give way to the laws of God? But now it is apparent, that you have undertaken the defence of this royal cause, not so much out of your own inclination, as partly because you were hired, and that at a good round price too, considering how things are with him that set you on work; and partly, it is like, out of expectation of some greater reward hereafter; to publish a scandalous libel against the English, who are injurious to none of their neighbours, and meddle with their own matters only. If there were no such thing as that in the case, is it credible that any man should be so impudent or so mad, as though he be a stranger, and at a great distance from us, yet of his own accord to intermeddle with our affairs, and side with a party? What the devil, is it to you
what

what the English do amongst themselves? What would you have, pragmatical puppy? What would you be at? Have you no concerns of your own at home? I wish you had the same concerns that that famous Olus, your fellow busy-body in the Epigram, had; and perhaps so you have; you deserve them, I am sure. Or did that hotspur your wife, who encouraged you to write what you have done for out-lawed Charles's sake, promise you some profitable professor's place in England, and God knows what gratifications at Charles's return? But assure yourselves, my mistress and my master, that England admits neither of Wolves, nor owners of Wolves: So that it is no wonder you spit so much venom at our English mastiffs. It were better for you to return to those illustrious titles of yours in France; first to that hunger-starved lordship of yours at * St. Lou; and in the next place to the sacred consistory of the most christian king. Being a counsellor to the prince, you are at too great a distance from your own country. But I see full well that she neither desires you, nor your counsel; nor did it appear she did, when you were there a few years ago, and began to lick a cardinal's trencher; she is in the right, by my troth, and can very willingly suffer such a little fellow as you, that are but one half of a man, to run up and down with your mistress of a wife, and your desks full of trifles and fooleries, till you light somewhere or other upon a stipend, large enough for a knight of the grammar, or an illustrious critic on horseback; if any prince or state has a mind to hire a vagabond doctor, that is to be sold at a good round price. But here is one that will bid for you; whether you are a merchantable commodity or not, and what you are worth, we shall see by and by. You say, "the parricides assert, that the government of England is not merely kingly, but that it is a mixt government." Sir Thomas Smith, a country-man of ours in Edward the Sixth's days, a good lawyer, and a statesman, one whom you yourself will not call a parricide, in the beginning of a book which he wrote "of the commonwealth of England," asserts the same thing, and not of our government only, but of almost all others in the world, and that out of Aristotle; and he says it is not possible that any government should otherwise subsist. But as if you thought it a crime to say any thing, and not unsay it again, you repeat your former threadbare contradictions. You say, "there neither is nor ever was any nation that did not understand by the very name of a king, a person whose authority is inferior to God alone, and who is accountable to no other." And yet a little after you confess, "that the name of a king was formerly given to such powers and magistrates, as had not a full and absolute right of themselves, but had a dependance upon the people, as the Suffetes among the Carthaginians, the Hebrew judges, the kings of the Lacedemonians, and of Arragon." Are you not very consistent with yourself? Then you reckon up five several sorts of monarchies out of Aristotle; in one of which only that right obtained, which you say is common to all kings. Concerning which I have said already more than once, that neither doth Aristotle give an instance of any such monarchy, nor was there ever any such in being; the other four he clearly demonstrates that they were bounded by established laws, and the king's power subject to those laws. The first of which four was that of the Lacedemonians, which in his opinion did of all others best deserve the name of a kingdom. The second was such as obtained among barbarians, which was lasting, because regulated by laws, and because the people willingly submitted to it; whereas by the same author's opinion in his third book, what king soever retains the sovereignty against the people's will, is no longer to be accounted a king, but a downright tyrant; all which is true likewise of his third sort of kings, which he calls *Æsymnetes*, who were chosen by the people, and most commonly for a certain time only, and for some particular purposes, such as the Roman dictators were. The fourth sort he makes of such as reigned in the heroical days, upon whom for their

* St. Lou, in Latin, *Sanctus Lupus*, Saint Wolf, is the name of a place in France, where Salmasius had some small estate, and was called so from St. Lupus a German Bishop, who with St. German came over into England, Anno Dom. 429.

extraordinary merits the people of their own accord conferred the government, but yet bounded by laws; nor could these retain the sovereignty against the will of the people; nor do these four sorts of kingly governments differ, he says, from tyranny in any thing else, but only in that these governments are with the good liking of the people, and that against their will. The fifth sort of kingly government, which he calls *παρβασιλευς*, or absolute monarchy, in which the supreme power resides in the king's person, which you pretend to be the right of all kings, is utterly condemned by the philosopher, as neither for the good of mankind, nor consonant to justice or nature, unless some people should be content to live under such a government, and withal confer it upon such as excel all others in virtue. These things any man may read in the third book of his Politics. But you, I believe, that once in your life you might appear witty and florid, pleased yourself with making a comparison "betwixt these five sorts of kingly government, and the five zones of the world; betwixt the two extremes of kingly power, there are three more temperate species interposed, as there lie three zones betwixt the torrid and the frigid." Pretty rogue! what ingenious comparisons he always makes us! may you for ever be banished, whither you yourself condemn an Absolute Kingdom to be, that is, to the frigid Zone, which when you are there, will be doubly cold to what it was before. In the mean while we shall expect that new-fashioned sphere which you describe, from you our modern Archimedes, in which there shall be two extreme Zones, one torrid, and the other frigid, and three temperate ones lying betwixt. "The kings of the Lacedemonians, you say, might lawfully be imprisoned, but it was not lawful to put them to death." Why not? Because the ministers of justice, and some foreign soldiers, being surprised at the novelty of the thing, thought it not lawful to lead Agis to his execution, though condemned to die? And the people of Lacedemon, were displeased at his death, not because condemned to die, though a king, but because he was a good man and popular, and had been circumvented by a faction of the great ones. Says Plutarch, "Agis was the first king that was put to death by the Ephori;" in which words he does not pretend to tell us what lawfully might be done, but what actually was done. For to imagine that such as may lawfully accuse a king, and imprison him, may not also lawfully put him to death, is a childish conceit. At last you betake yourself to give an account of the right of English kings. "There never was," you say, "but one king in England." This you say, because you had said before, that "unless a king be sole in the government, he cannot be a king." Which if it be true, some of them, who I had thought had been kings of England, were not really so; for to omit many of our Saxon kings, who had either their sons, or their brothers partners with them in the government, it is known that king Henry II. of the Norman race, reigned together with his son. "Let them shew," say you, "a precedent of any kingdom under the government of a single person, who has not an absolute power: though in some kingdoms more remiss, in others more intense." Do you show any power that is absolute, and yet remiss, you ask; is not that power that is absolute, the supreme power of all? How can it then be both supreme and remiss? Whatsoever kings you shall acknowledge to be invested with a remiss (or a less) power, those I will easily make appear to have no absolute power; and consequently to be inferior to a people, free by nature, who is both its own law-giver, and can make the regal power more or less intense or remiss; that is, greater or less. Whether the whole island of Britain was anciently governed by kings, or no, is uncertain. It is most likely that the form of their government changed according to the exigencies of the times. Whence Tacitus says, "the Britains anciently were under kings; now the great men amongst them divide them into parties and factions." When the Romans left them, they were about forty years without kings; they were not always therefore under a kingly government, as you say they were. But when they were so, that the kingdom was hereditary, I positively deny; which that it was not, is evident both from the series of their kings, and their way of creating them: for the consent of the people

is asked in express words. When the king has taken the accustomed oath, the archbishop stepping to every side of the stage erected for that purpose, asks the people four several times in these words, "Do you consent to have this man to be your king?" Just as if he spoke to them in the Roman stile, *Vultis, Jubetis hunc Regnare?* "Is it your pleasure, do you appoint this man to reign?" Which would be needless, if the kingdom were by the law hereditary. But with kings, usurpation passes very frequently for law and right. You go about to ground Charles's right to the crown, who was so often conquered himself, upon the right of conquest. William, surnamed the Conqueror, forsooth, subdued us. But they who are not strangers to our history, know full well, that the strength of the English nation was not so broken in that one fight at Hastings, but that they might easily have renewed the war. But they chose rather to accept of a king, than to be under a conqueror and a tyrant: They swear therefore to William, to be his liege-men, and he swears to them at the altar, to carry himself towards them as a good king ought to do in all respects. When he broke his word, and the English betook themselves again to their arms, being dissident of his strength, he renewed his oath upon the Holy Evangelists, to observe the ancient laws of England. And therefore, if after that he miserably oppressed the English, (as you say he did) he did it not by right of conquest, but by right of perjury. Besides, it is certain, that many ages ago, the conquerors and conquered coalesced into one and the same people: So that that right of conquest, if any such ever were, must needs have been antiquated long ago. His own words at his death, which I give you out of a French Manuscript written at Caen, put all out of doubt, "I appoint no man (says he) to inherit the kingdom of England." By which words, both his pretended right of conquest, and the hereditary right, were disclaimed at his death, and buried together with him. I see now that you have gotten a place at court, as I foretold you would; you are made the king's chief treasurer and steward of his court-craft: And what follows, you seem to write *ex officio*, as by virtue of your office, magnificent Sir. "If any preceding kings, being thereunto compelled by factions of great men, or seditions amongst the common people, have receded in some measure from their right, that cannot prejudice the successor; but that he is at liberty to resume it." You say well; if therefore at any time our ancestors have through neglect lost any thing that was their right, why should that prejudice us their posterity? If they would promise for themselves to become slaves, they could make no such promise for us; who shall always retain the same right of delivering ourselves out of slavery, that they had of enslaving themselves to any whomsoever. You wonder how it comes to pass that a king of Great-Britain must now-a-days be looked upon as one of the magistrates of the kingdom only; whereas in all other kingly governments in Christendom, kings are invested with a free and absolute authority. For the Scots, I remit you to Buchanan: For France, your own native country, to which you seem to be a stranger, to Hottoman's *Franco-Gallia*, and Girardus a French historian; for the rest, to other authors, of whom none that I know of, were Independents: Out of whom you might have learned a quite other lesson concerning the right of kings, than what you teach. Not being able to prove that a tyrannical power belongs to the kings of England by right of conquest, you try now to do it by right of perjury. Kings profess themselves to reign "by the Grace of God:" What if they had professed themselves to be Gods? I believe if they had, you might easily have been brought to become one of their priests. So the archbishops of Canterbury pretended to archbishop it by "divine providence." Are you such a fool, as to deny the pope's being a king in the Church, that you may make the king greater than a pope in the state? But in the statutes of the realm the king is called our Lord. You are become of a sudden a wonderful Nomenclator of our statutes: But you know not that many are called lords and masters, who are not really so: You know not how unreasonable a thing it is to judge of truth and right by titles of honour, not to say of flattery. Make the same inference, if you will, from the parliament's being called the King's parliament; for

for it is called the king's bridle too, or a bridle to the king: and therefore the king is no more lord or master of his parliament, than a horse is of his bridle. But why not the king's parliament, since the king "summons them?" I'll tell you why; because the consuls used to indict a meeting of the senate, yet were they not lords over that council. When the king therefore summons or calls together a parliament, he does it by virtue and in discharge of that office, which he has received from the people, that he may advise with them about the weighty affairs of the kingdom, not his own particular affairs. Or when at any time the parliament debated of the king's own affairs, if any could properly be called his own, they were always the last things they did; and it was in their choice when to debate of them, and whether at all or no, and depended not upon the king's pleasure. And they whom it concerns to know this, know very well, that parliaments anciently, whether summoned or not, might by law meet twice a year: But the laws are called too, "the king's laws." These are flattering ascriptions; a king of England can of himself make no law: For he was not constituted to make laws, but to see those laws kept, which the people made. And you yourself here confess, that "parliaments meet to make laws;" wherefore the law is also called the law of the land, and the people's law. Whence king Ethelstane in the preface to his laws, speaking to all the people, "I have granted you every thing," says he, "by your own law." And in the form of the oath, which the kings of England used to take before they were made kings, the people stipulate with them thus; "Will you grant those just laws, which the people shall chuse?" The king answers, "I will." And you are infinitely mistaken in saying, that "when there is no parliament sitting, the king governs the whole state of the kingdom, to all intents and purposes, by a regal power." For he can determine nothing of any moment, with respect to either peace or war; nor can he put any stop to the proceedings of the courts of justice. And the judges therefore swear, that they will do nothing judicially, but according to law, though the king by word, or mandate, or letters under his own seal, should command the contrary. Hence it is that the king is often said in our law to be an Infant; and to possess his rights and dignities, as a child or a ward does his: See the Mirror, cap. 4. Sect. 22. And hence is that common saying amongst us, that "the king can do no wrong:" Which you, like a rascal, interpret thus, "Whatever the king does, is no injury, because he is not liable to be punished for it." By this very comment, if there were nothing else, the wonderful impudence and villany of this fellow, discovers itself sufficiently. "It belongs to the head," you say, "to command, and not to the members: The king is the head of the parliament." You would not trifle thus, if you had any guts in your brains. You are mistaken again (but there is no end of your mistakes) in not distinguishing the king's counsellors from the states of the realm: For neither ought he to make choice of all of them, nor of any of them, which the rest do not approve of; but for electing any member of the house of commons, he never so much as pretended to it. Whom the people appointed to that service, they were severally chosen by the votes of all the people in their respective cities, towns, and counties. I speak now of things universally known, and therefore I am the shorter. But you say, "it is false that the parliament was instituted by the people, as the worshippers of faint Independency assert." Now I see why you took so much pains in endeavouring to subvert the papacy; you carry another pope in your belly, as we say. For what else should you be in labour of, the wife of a woman, a he-wolf, impregnated by a she-wolf, but either a monster, or some new sort of papacy? You now make he-saints and she-saints, at your pleasure, as if you were a true genuine pope. You absolve kings of all their sins, and as if you had utterly vanquished and subdued your antagonist the pope, you adorn yourself with his spoils. But because you have not yet profligated the pope quite, till the second and third, and perhaps the fourth and fifth part of your book of his supremacy come out, which book will nauseate a great many readers to death, sooner than you'll get the better of the pope by it; let it suffice you in the mean time, I beseech you, to become some antipope or other. There's another she-saint, besides that Independency that you deride,

deride, which you have canonized in good earnest; and that is, the tyranny of kings: You shall therefore by my consent be the high-priest of tyranny; and that you may have all the pope's titles, you shall be a "servant of the servants," not of God, but of the court. For that curse pronounced upon Canaan, seems to stick as close to you, as your shirt. You call the people "a beast." What are you then yourself? For neither can that sacred consistory, nor your lordship of St. Lou, exempt you its master from being one of the people, nay, of the common people; nor can make you other than what you really are, a most loathsome beast. Indeed, the writings of the prophets shadow out to us the monarchy and dominion of great kings by the name, and under the resemblance of a great beast. You say, that "there is no mention of parliaments held under our kings, that reigned before William the conqueror." It is not worth while to jangle about a French word: The thing was always in being; and you yourself allow that in the Saxon times, Concilia Sapientum, Wittena-gemots, are mentioned. And there are wise men among the body of the people, as well as amongst the nobility. But "in the statute of Merton made in the twentieth year of king Henry the Third, the earls and barons are only named." Thus you are always imposed upon by words, who yet have spent your whole life in nothing else but words; for we know very well that in that age, not only the guardians of the cinque-ports, and magistrates of cities, but even tradesmen are sometimes called barons; and without doubt they might much more reasonably call every member of parliament, tho' never so much a commoner, by the name of a baron. For that in the fifty second year of the same king's reign, the commoners as well as the lords were summoned, the statute of Marlbridge, and most other statutes, declare in express words; which commoners king Edward the Third, in the preface to the statute-staple, calls, "Magnates Comitatum, the great men of the counties," as you very learnedly quote it for me; those to wit, "that came out of the several counties, and served for them;" which number of men constituted the house of commons, and neither were lords, nor could be. Besides, a book more ancient than those statutes, called, "Modus habendi Parliamenta, i. e. the manner of holding parliaments" tells us, that the king and the commons may hold a parliament, and enact laws, tho' the lords, the bishops are absent; but that with the lords, and the bishops, in the absence of the commons, no parliament can be held. And there is a reason given for it, viz. because kings held parliaments and councils with their people before any lords or bishops were made; besides, the lords serve for themselves only, the commons each for the county, city, or borough that sent them. And that therefore the commons in parliament represent the whole body of the nation; in which respect they are more worthy, and every way preferable to the house of peers. "But the power of Judicature," you say, "never was invested in the house of commons." Nor was the king ever possessed of it: Remember tho', that originally all power proceeded, and yet does proceed from the people. Which Marcus Tullius excellently well shows in his oration, "De lege Agraria, of the Agrarian law:" "As all powers, authorities, and public administrations ought to be derived from the whole body of the people; so those of them ought in an especial manner so to be derived, which are ordained and appointed for the common benefit and interest of all, to which employments every particular person may both give his vote for the chusing such persons, as he thinks will take most care of the public, and withal by voting and making interest for them, lay such obligations upon them, as may entitle them to their friendship, and good offices in time to come." Here you see the true rise and original of parliaments, and that it was much ancients than the Saxon chronicles. Whilst we may dwell in such a light of truth and wisdom, as Cicero's age afforded, you labour in vain to blind us with the darkness of obscurer times. By the saying whereof I would not be understood to derogate in the least from the authority and prudence of our ancestors, who most certainly went further in the enacting of good laws, than either the ages they lived in, or their own learning or education seem to have been capable of; and tho' some-

sometimes they made laws that were none of the best, yet as being conscious to themselves of the ignorance and infirmity of human nature, they have conveyed this doctrine down to posterity, as the foundation of all laws, which likewise all our lawyers admit, that if any law, or custom, be contrary to the law of God, of nature, or of reason, it ought to be looked upon as null and void. Whence it follows, that though it were possible for you to discover any statute, or other public sanction, which ascribed to the king a tyrannical power, since that would be repugnant to the will of God, to nature, and to right reason, you may learn from that general and primary law of ours, which I have just now quoted, that it will be null and void. But you will never be able to find that any such right of kings has the least foundation in our law. Since it is plain therefore, that the power of judicature was originally in the people themselves, and that the people never did by any royal law part with it to the king, (for the kings of England neither use to judge any man, nor can by the law do it, otherwise than according to laws settled and agreed to: Fleta, Book 1. Cap. 17.) it follows, that this power remains yet whole and entire in the people themselves. For that it was either never committed to the house of peers, or if it were, that it may lawfully be taken from them again, you yourself will not deny. But, "It is in the king's power," you say, "to make a village into a borough, and that into a city; and consequently, the king does in effect create those that constitute the Commons House of Parliament." But, I say, that even towns and boroughs are more ancient than kings; and that the people is the people, though they should live in the open fields. And now we are extremely well pleased with your Anglicisms, COUNTY COURT, THE TURNE, HUNDREDA: You have quickly learnt to count your hundred Jacobusses in English.

Quis expedivit Salmasio suam HUNDREDAM?

Picamque docuit verba nostra conari?

Magister artis venter, & Jacobæi

Centum, exulantis viscera marsupii Regis.

Quod si dolosi spes refulserit nummi,

Ipsæ Antichristi modò qui Primatum Papæ

Minatus uno est dissipare sufflatu,

Cantabit ultrò Cardinalitium melos.

Who taught Salmasius, that French chatt'ring pye,

To aim at English, and HUNDREDA cry?

The starving rascal, flush'd with just a Hundred

English Jacobusses, HUNDREDA blunder'd.

An out-law'd King's last stock.---A hundred more,

Would make him pimp for th'Antichristian whore;

And in Rome's praise employ his poison'd breath,

Who threat'ned once to stink the Pope to death.

The next thing you do is to trouble us with a long discourse of the earls and the barons, to show that the king made them all; which we readily grant, and for that reason they were most commonly at the king's beck; and therefore we have done well to take care, that for the future they shall not be judges of a free people. You affirm, that "the power of calling parliaments as often as he pleases, and of dissolving them when he pleases, has belonged to the king time out of mind." Whether such a vile, mercenary foreigner as you, who transcribe what some fugitives dictate to you, or the express letter of our own laws are more to be credited in this matter, we shall enquire hereafter. But say you, "there is another argument, and an invincible one, to prove the power of the kings of England superior to that of the parliament; the king's power

is perpetual and of course, whereby he administers the government singly without the parliament; that of the parliament is extraordinary, or out of course, and limited to particulars only, nor can they enact any thing so as to be binding in law, without the king." Where does the great force of this argument lie? In the words "of course and perpetual?" Why, many inferior magistrates have an ordinary and perpetual power, those whom we call justices of peace. Have they therefore the supreme power? And I have said already, that the king's power is committed to him, to take care, by interposing his authority, that nothing be done contrary to law, and that he may see to the due observation of our laws, not to top his own upon us: and consequently that the king has no power out of his courts; nay, all the ordinary power is rather the people's, who determine all controversies themselves by juries of twelve men. And hence it is, that when a malefactor is asked at his arraignment, "How will you be tried?" he answers always, according to law and custom, "by God and my country;" not by God and the king, or the king's deputy. But the authority of the parliament, which indeed and in truth is the supreme power of the people committed to that senate, if it may be called extraordinary, it must be by reason of its eminence and superiority; else it is known they are called Ordines, and therefore cannot properly be said to be extra ordinem, out of order; and if not actually, as they say, yet virtually they have a perpetual power and authority over all courts and ordinary magistrates, and that without the king. And now it seems our barbarous terms grate upon your critical ears, forsooth! whereas, if I had leisure, or that it were worth my while, I could reckon up so many barbarisms of yours in this one book, as if you were to be chastized for them as you deserve, all the school-boys ferula's in Christendom would be broken upon you; nor would you receive so many pieces of gold as that wretched poet did of old, but a great many more boxes o'th'ear. You say, 'It is a prodigy more monstrous than all the most absurd opinions in the world put together, that the Bedlams should make a distinction betwixt the king's power and his person.' I will not quote what every author has said upon this subject; but if by the words *Personam Regis*, you mean what we call in English, the person of the king; Chrysostom, who was no Bedlam, might have taught you, that it is no absurd thing to make a distinction betwixt that and his power; for that father explains the apostle's command of being subject to the higher powers, to be meant of the thing, the power itself, and not of the persons of the magistrates. And why may not I say that a king, who acts any thing contrary to law, acts so far forth as a private person, or a tyrant, and not in the capacity of a king invested with a legal authority? If you do not know that there may be in one and the same man more Persons or Capacities than one, and that those capacities may in thought and conception be severed from the man himself, you are altogether ignorant both of Latin and common sense. But this you say to absolve kings from all sin and guilt; and that you may make us believe that you are gotten into the chair yourself, which you have pulled the pope out of. "The king," you say, "is supposed not capable of committing any crime, because no punishment is consequential upon any crime of his." Whoever therefore is not punished, offends not; it is not the theft, but the punishment that makes the thief. Salmasius the Grammarian commits no Solœcisms now, because he is from under the ferula; when you have overthrown the pope, let these, for God's sake, be the canons of your pontificate, or at least your indulgencies, whether you shall chuse to be called the high-priest St. Tyranny, or St. Slavery. I pass by the reproachful language which towards the latter end of the chapter you give the state of the commonwealth, and the church of England; it is common to such as you are, you contemptible varlet, to rail at those things most, that are most praise-worthy. But that I may not seem to have asserted any thing rashly concerning the right of the kings of England, or rather concerning the people's right with respect to their princes; I will now alledge out of our ancient histories a few things indeed of many, but such as will make it evident that the English lately tried their king according to the settled laws

laws of the realm, and the customs of their ancestors. After the Romans quitted this island, the Britains for about forty years were *sui juris*, and without any kings at all. Of whom those they first set up, some they put to death. And for that, Gildas reprehends them, not as you do, for killing their kings, but for killing them uncondemned, and (to use his own words,) "Non pro veri examinatione," without enquiring into the matter of fact. Vortigern was for his incestuous marriage with his own daughter condemned (as Nennius informs us, the most ancient of all our historians next to Gildas) by St. German, "and a general council of the Britains," and his son Vortimer set up in his stead. This came to pass not long after St. Augustine's death, which is enough to discover how foolish you are, to say, as you have done, that it was a Pope, and Zachary by name, who first held the lawfulness of judging kings. About the year of our Lord 600, Morcantius, who then reigned in Wales, was by Oudeceus bishop of Llandaff, condemned to exile, for the murder of his uncle, though he got the sentence off by bestowing some lands upon the church. Come we now to the Saxons, whose laws we have, and therefore I shall quote none of their precedents. Remember that the Saxons were of a German extract, who never invested their kings with any absolute, unlimited power, but consulted in a body of the more weighty affairs of government; whence we may perceive that in the time of our Saxon ancestors Parliaments (the name itself only excepted) had the supreme authority. The name they gave them, was "Councils of Wise-men;" and this in the reign of Ethelbert, of whom Bede says, "that he made laws in imitation of the Roman laws, *cum concilio sapientum*; by the advice, or in a council of his wise-men." So Edwin, king of Northumberland; and Ina king of the West-Saxons, "having consulted with their wise-men, and the elders of the people," made new laws. Other laws king Alfred made, "by the advice" in like manner of "his Wise-men;" and he says himself, "that it was by the consent of them all, that they were commanded to be observed." From these and many other like places, it is as clear as the sun, that chosen men even from amongst the common people, were members of the supreme councils, unless we must believe that no men are wise, but the nobility. We have likewise a very ancient book, called the "Mirror of Justice," in which we are told, that the Saxons, when they first subdued the Britains, and chose themselves kings, required in oath of them, to submit to the judgment of the law, as much as any of their subjects, Cap. 1. Sect. 2. In the same place it is said, that it is but just that the king have his peers in parliament, to take cognizance of wrongs done by the king, or the queen; and that there was a law made in king Alfred's time, that parliaments should be holden twice a year at London, or oftner, if need were: Which law, when through neglect it grew into disuse, was revived by two statutes in king Edward the Third's time. And in another ancient manuscript, called "Modus tenendi Parlameta," we read thus, 'If the king dissolve the parliament before they have dispatched the business, for which the council was summoned, he is guilty of perjury; and shall be reputed to have broken his coronation oath.' For how can he be said to grant those good laws, which the people chuse, as he is sworn to do, if he hinders the people from chusing them, either by summoning parliaments seldomer, or by dissolving them sooner than the public affairs require, or admit? And that oath, which the kings of England take at their coronation, has always been looked upon by our lawyers, as a most sacred law. And what remedy can be found to obviate the great dangers of the whole state (which is the very end of summoning parliaments) if that great and august assembly may be dissolved at the pleasure many time of a silly, head-strong king? To absent himself from them, is certainly less than to dissolve them; and yet by our laws, as that Modus lays them down, the king neither can, nor ought to absent himself from his parliament, unless he be really indisposed in health; nor then neither, till twelve of the peers have been with him to inspect his body, and give the parliament an account of his indisposition. Is this like the carriage of servants to a master? On the other hand, the house of commons, without whom there can be

no parliament held, though summoned by the king, may withdraw, and having made a secession, expostulate with the king concerning male-administration, as the same book has it. But, which is the greatest thing of all, amongst the laws of king Edward, commonly called the Confessor, there is one very excellent, relating to the kingly office; which office, if the king do not discharge as he ought, then, says the law, "he shall not retain so much as the name of a king." And lest these words should not be sufficiently understood, the example of Chilperic king of France is subjoin'd, whom the people for that cause deposed. And that by this law a wicked king is liable to punishment, that sword of king Edward, called Curtana, denotes to us, which the earl of Chester used to carry in the solemn procession at a coronation; "A token, says Matthew Paris, that he has authority by law to punish the king, if he will not do his duty:" and the sword is hardly ever made use of but in capital punishments. This same law, together with other laws of that good king Edward, did William the Conqueror ratify in the fourth year of his reign, and in a very full council held at Verulam, confirmed it with a most solemn oath: And by so doing, he not only extinguished his right of conquest, if he ever had any over us, but subjected himself to be judged according to the tenor of this very law. And his son Henry swore to the observance of king Edward's laws, and of this amongst the rest; and upon those only terms it was, that he was chosen king, while his elder brother Robert was alive. The same oath was taken by all succeeding kings, before they were crowned. Hence our ancient and famous lawyer Bracton, in his first book, Chap. viii. "There is no king in the case," says he, "where will rules the roast, and law does not take place." And in his third Book, Chap. ix. "A king is a king so long as he rules well; he becomes a tyrant when he oppresses the people committed to his charge." And in the same chapter, "The king ought to use the power of law and right, as God's minister and vice-gerent; the power of wrong is the devil's, and not God's; when the king turns aside to do injustice, he is the minister of the Devil." The very same words almost another ancient lawyer has, who was the author of the book called "Fleta;" both of them remembered that truly royal law of king Edward, that fundamental maxim in our law, which I have formerly mentioned, by which nothing is to be accounted a law, that is contrary to the laws of God, or of reason; no more than a tyrant can be said to be a king, or a minister of the devil a minister of God. Since therefore the law is chiefly right reason, if we are bound to obey a king, and a minister of God; by the very same reason, and the very same law, we ought to resist a tyrant, and a minister of the devil. And because controversies arise oftner about names than things, the same authors tell us, that a king of England, though he have not lost the name of a king, yet is as liable to be judged, and ought so to be, as any of the common people. Bracton, Book I. Chap. viii. Fleta, Book I. Chap. xvii. "No man ought to be greater than the king in the administration of justice; but he himself ought to be as little as the least in receiving justice, si peccat, if he offend." Others read it, si petat. Since our kings therefore are liable to be judged, whether by the name of tyrants, or of kings, it must not be difficult to assign their legal judges. Nor will it be amiss to consult the same authors upon that point. Bracton, Book I. Chap. xvi. Fleta, Book I. Chap. 17. "The king has his superiors in the government; the law, by which he is made king; and his court, to wit, the earls, and the barons: Comites (earls) are as much as to say, companions; and he that has a companion, has a master; and therefore, if the king will be without a bridle, that is, not govern by law, they ought to bridle him." That the commons are comprehended in the word barons, has been shown already; nay, and in the books of our ancient laws they are frequently said to have been called peers of parliament: and especially in the *Modus tenendi*, &c. "There shall be chosen" (says that book) "out of all the peers of the realm, five and twenty persons, of whom five shall be knights, five citizens, and five burghesses; and two knights of a county, have a greater vote in granting and rejecting than the greatest

earl in England." And it is but reasonable they should, for they vote for a whole county, &c. the earls for themselves only. And who can but perceive that those Patent Earls, whom you call earls made by writ (since we have now none that hold their earldoms by tenure) are very unfit persons to try the king, who conferred their honours upon them? Since therefore by our law, as appears by that old book, called "the Mirror, the king has his peers, who in parliament have cognizance of wrongs done by the king to any of his people; and since it is notoriously known, that the meanest man in the kingdom may even in inferior courts have the benefit of the law against the king himself, in case of any injury, or wrong sustained; how much more consonant to justice, how much more necessary is it, that in case the king oppresses all his people, there should be such as have authority not only to restrain him, and keep him within bounds, but to judge and punish him; for that government must needs be very ill, and most ridiculously constituted, in which remedy is provided in case of little injuries, done by the prince to private persons, and no remedy, no redress for greater, no care taken for the safety of the whole; no provision made to the contrary, but that the king may, without any law, ruin all his subjects, when at the same time he cannot by law so much as hurt any one of them. And since I have shown that it is neither good manners, nor expedient, that the Lords should be the King's judges; it follows, that the power of judicature in that case does wholly, and by very good right, belong to the commons, who are both peers of the realm, and barons, and have the power and authority of all the people committed to them. For since (as we find it expressly in our written law, which I have already cited) the commons together with the king made a good parliament without either lords or bishops, because before either lords or bishops had a being, kings held parliaments with their commons only; by the very same reason the commons apart must have the sovereign power without the king, and a power of judging the king himself; because before there ever was a king, they in the name of the whole body of the nation held counsels and parliaments, had the power of judicature, made laws, and made the kings themselves, not to lord it over the people, but to administer their public affairs. Whom if the king, instead of so doing, shall endeavour to injure and oppress, our law pronounces him from time forward not so much as to retain the name of a king, to be no such thing as a king; and if he be no king, what need we trouble ourselves to find out peers for him? For being then by all good men adjudged to be a tyrant, there are none but who are peers good enough for him, and proper enough to pronounce sentence of death upon him judicially. These things being so, I think I have sufficiently proved what I undertook, by many authorities, and written laws; to wit, that since the commons have authority by very good right to try the king, and since they have actually tried him, and put him to death, for the mischief he had done both in church and state, and without all hope of amendment, they have done nothing therein but what was just and regular, for the interest of the state, in discharging of their trust, becoming their dignity, and according to the laws of the land. And I cannot upon this occasion, but congratulate myself with the honour of having had such ancestors, who founded this government with no less prudence, and in as much liberty as the most worthy of the ancient Romans or Grecians ever founded any of theirs: and they must needs, if they have any knowledge of our affairs, rejoice over their posterity, who when they were almost reduced to slavery, yet with so much wisdom and courage vindicated and asserted the state, which they so wisely founded upon so much liberty, from the unruly government of a king.

C H A P. IX.

I Think by this time it is sufficiently evident, that kings of England may be judged even by the laws of England ; and that they have their proper judges, which was the thing to be proved. What do you do farther ? (for whereas you repeat many things that you have said before, I do not intend to repeat the answers that I have given them) “ It is an easy thing to demonstrate, even from the nature of the things for which parliaments are summoned, that the king is above the parliament. The parliament, (you say,) is wont to be assembled upon weighty affairs, such as wherein the safety of the kingdom and of the people is concerned.” If therefore the king call parliaments together, not for his own concerns, but those of the nation, nor to settle those neither, but by their own consent, at their own discretion, what is he more than a minister, and as it were an agent for the people ? since without their suffrages that are chosen by the people, he cannot enact the least thing whatsoever, either with relation to himself, or any body else ? Which proves likewise that it is the king’s duty to call parliaments whenever the people desire it ; since the people’s, and not the king’s concerns, are to be treated of by that assembly, and to be ordered as they see cause. For although the king’s assent be required for fashion sake, which in lesser matters, that concerned the welfare of private persons only, he might refuse, and use that form, “ the king will advise ;” yet in those greater affairs that concerned the public safety, and liberty of the people in general, he had no negative voice : for it would have been against his coronation-oath to deny his assent in such cases, which was as binding to him as any law could be, and against the chief article of Magna Charta, cap. 29. ‘ We will not deny to any man, nor will we delay to render to every man right and justice.’ Shall it not be in the king’s power to deny justice, and shall it be in his power to deny the enacting of just laws ? Could he not deny justice to any particular person, and could he to all his people ? Could he not do it in inferior courts, and could he in the supreme court of all ? Or, can any king be so arrogant as to pretend to know what is just and profitable better than the whole body of the people ? Especially, since ‘ he is created and chosen for this very end and purpose, to do justice to all,’ as Bracton says, lib. iii. c. 9. that is, to do justice according to such laws as the people agree upon. Hence is what we find in our records, 7 H. IV. Rott. Parl. num. 59. The king has no prerogative that derogates from justice and equity. And formerly when kings have refused to confirm acts of parliament, to wit, Magna Charta, and some others, our ancestors have brought them to it by force of arms. And yet our lawyers never were of opinion that those laws were less valid, or less binding, since the king was forced to assent to no more than what he ought in justice to have assented to voluntarily, and without constraint. Whilst you go about to prove that kings of other nations have been as much under the power of their senates or councils, as our kings were, you do not argue us into slavery, but them into liberty. In which you do but that over again, that you have from the very beginning of your discourse, and which some silly Leguleians now and then do, to argue unawares, against their own clients. But you say, “ We confess that the king, wherever he be, yet is supposed still to be present in his parliament by virtue of his power ; inasmuch, that whatever is transacted there, is supposed to be done by the king himself :” And then as if you had got some petty bribe or small morsel, and tickled with the remembrance of your purse of gold, “ We take,” say you, “ what they give us ;” and take a halter then, for I am sure you deserve it. But we do not give it for granted, which is the thing you thought would follow from thence, “ That therefore that court acts only by virtue of a delegated power from the king.” For when we say that the regal power, be it what it will, cannot be absent from the parliament, do we thereby acknowledge that power to be supreme ? Does not the king’s authority seem rather to be transferred

ferred to the parliament, and, as being the lesser of the two, to be comprised in the greater? Certainly, if the parliament may rescind the king's acts whether he will or no, and revoke privileges granted by him, to whomsoever they be granted: if they may set bounds to his prerogative, as they see cause, if they may regulate his yearly revenue, and the expences of his court, his retinue, and generally all the concerns of his household; if they may remove his most intimate friends and counsellors, and, as it were, pluck them out of his bosom, and bring them to condign punishment; Finally, if any subject may by law appeal from the king to the parliament (all which things, that they may lawfully be done, and have been frequently practised, both our histories and records, and the most eminent of our lawyers assure us) I suppose no man in his right wits will deny the authority of the parliament to be superior to that of the king. For even in an Interregnum the authority of the parliament is in being, and (than which nothing is more common in our histories) they have often made a free choice of a successor, without any regard to a hereditary descent. In short, the parliament is the supreme council of the nation, constituted and appointed by a most free people, and armed with ample power and authority, for this end and purpose; viz. to consult together upon the most weighty affairs of the kingdom; the king was created to put their laws in execution. Which thing after the parliament themselves had declared in a public edict (for such is the justice of their proceedings, that of their own accord they have been willing to give an account of their actions to other nations,) is it not prodigious, that such a pitiful fellow as you are, a man of no authority, of no credit, of no figure in the world, a meer Burgundian slave, should have the impudence to accuse the parliament of England, asserting by a public instrument their own and their country's right, "of a detestable and horrid imposture?" Your country may be ashamed, you rascal, to have brought forth a little inconsiderable fellow of such profligate impudence. But perhaps you have somewhat to tell us that may be for our good: Go on, we will hear you. "What laws," say you, "can a parliament enact, in which the bishops are not present?" Did you then, you madman, expel the order of bishops out of the church to introduce them into the state? O wicked wretch! who ought to be delivered over to Satan, whom the church ought to forbid her communion, as being a hypocrite, and an atheist, and no civil society of men to acknowledge as a member, being a public enemy, and a plague-fore to the common liberty of mankind; who, where the gospel fails you, endeavour to prove out of Aristotle, Halicarnassæus, and then from some popish authorities of the most corrupt ages, that the king of England is the head of the church of England, to the end that you may, as far as in you lies, bring in the bishops again, his intimates and table-companions, grown so of late, to rob and tyrannize in the church of God, whom God himself has deposed and degraded, whose very order you had heretofore asserted in print that it ought to be rooted out of the world, as destructive of and pernicious to the christian religion. What apostate did ever so shamefully and wickedly desert as this man has done, I do not say his own, which indeed never was any, but the christian doctrine which he had formerly asserted? "The bishops being put down, who under the king, and by his permission held plea of ecclesiastical causes, upon whom," say you, "will that jurisdiction devolve?" O villain! have some regard at least to your own conscience; remember before it be too late, if at least this admonition of mine come not too late, remember that this mocking the holy spirit of God is an inexpiable crime, and will not be left unpunished. Stop at last, and set bounds to your fury, lest the wrath of God lay hold upon you suddenly, for endeavouring to deliver the flock of God, his anointed ones that are not to be touched, to enemies and cruel tyrants, to be crushed and trampled on again, from whom himself by a high and stretched-out arm had so lately delivered them; and from whom you yourself maintained that they ought to be delivered, I know not whether for any good of theirs, or in order to the hardening of your own heart, and to further your own damnation. If the bishops have no right to lord it over the church, certainly much

less have kings, whatever the laws of men may be to the contrary. For they that know any thing of the gospel know thus much, that the government of the church is altogether divine and spiritual, and no civil constitution. Whereas you say, that "in secular affairs, the kings of England have always had the sovereign power;" our laws do abundantly declare that to be false. Our courts of justice are erected and suppressed, not by the king's authority, but that of the parliament; and yet in any of them, the meanest subject might go to law with the king: nor is it a rare thing for the judges to give judgment against him, which if the king should endeavour to obstruct by any prohibition, mandate, or letters, the judges were bound by law, and by their oaths not to obey him, but to reject such inhibitions as null and void in law. The king could not imprison any man, or seize his estate as forfeited; he could not punish any man, not summoned to appear in court, where not the king, but the ordinary judges gave sentence; which they frequently did, as I have said, against the king. Hence our Bracton, lib. 3. cap. 9. "The regal power," says he, "is according to law; he has no power to do any wrong, nor can the king do any thing but what the law warrants." Those lawyers that you have consulted, men that have lately fled their country, may tell you another tale, and acquaint you with some statutes, not very ancient neither, but made in king Edward IV. king Henry VI. and king Edward VIth's days; but they did not consider, that what power soever those statutes gave the king, was conferred upon him by authority of parliament, so that he was beholden to them for it; and the same power that conferred it, might at pleasure resume it. How comes it to pass that so acute a disputant as you, should suffer yourself to be imposed upon to that degree, as to make use of that very argument to prove the king's power to be absolute and supreme, than which nothing proves more clearly, that it is subordinate to that of the parliament? Our records of the greatest authority with us, declare, that our kings owe all their power, not to any right of inheritance, of conquest, or succession, but to the people. So in the parliament rolls of king Hen. 4. numb. 108. we read, that the kingly office and power was granted by the commons to king Henry IV. and before him, to his predecessor king Richard II. just as kings use to grant commissioners places, and lieutenantships to their deputies, by edicts and patents. Thus the house of commons ordered expressly to be entered upon record, 'That they had granted to king Richard to use the same good liberty that the kings of England before him had used:' Which because that king abused to the subversion of the laws, and "contrary to his oath at his coronation," the same persons that granted him that power, took it back again, and deposed him. The same men, as appears by the same record, declared in open parliament, 'That having confidence in the prudence and moderation of king Henry the IVth, they will and enact, That he enjoy the same royal authority that his ancestors enjoyed.' Which if it had been any other than in the nature of a trust, as this was, either those houses of parliament were foolish and vain, to give what was none of their own, or those kings that were willing to receive as from them, what was already theirs, were too injurious both to themselves and their posterity; neither of which is likely. "A third part of the regal power" say you, is conversant about the militia; this the kings of England have used to order and govern, without fellow or competitor." This is as false as all the rest that you have taken upon the credit of fugitives: For in the first place, both our own histories, and those of foreigners, that have been any whit exact in the relation of our affairs, declare, that the making of peace and war, always did belong to the parliament. And the laws of St. Edward, which our kings were bound to swear that they would maintain, make this appear beyond all exception, in the chapter "De Heretochiis," viz. That there were certain officers appointed in every province and county throughout the kingdom, that were called Heretochs, in Latin Duces, Commanders of armies, that were to command the forces of the several counties, not for the honour of the crown only, but for the good of the realm. And they were chosen by the general council, and in the several
counties

counties at public assemblies of the inhabitants, as sheriffs ought to be chosen.' Whence it is evident, that the forces of the kingdom, and the commanders of those forces, were anciently, and ought to be still, not at the king's command, but at the people's; and that this most reasonable and just law obtained in this kingdom of ours, no less than heretofore it did in the commonwealth of the Romans. Concerning which, it will not be amiss to hear what Cicero says, Philip 1. 'All the legions, all the forces of the commonwealth, wheresoever they are, are the people of Rome's; nor are those legions that deserted the consul Antonius, said to have been Antony's, but the commonwealth's legions.' This very law of St. Edward, together with the rest, did William the conqueror, at the desire and instance of the people, confirm by oath, and added over and above, cap. 56. 'That all cities, boroughs, castles, should be so watched every night, as the sheriffs, the aldermen, and other magistrates, should think meet for the safety of the kingdom.' And in the 6th law, 'Castles, boroughs, and cities, were first built for the defence of the people, and therefore ought to be maintained free and entire, by all ways and means.' What then? Shall towns and places of strength in times of peace be guarded against thieves and robbers by common councils of the several places; and shall they not be defended in dangerous times of war, against both domestic and foreign hostility, by the common council of the whole nation? If this be not granted, there can be no Freedom, no Integrity, no reason in the guarding of them; nor shall we obtain any of those ends, for which the law itself tells us, that towns and fortresses were at first founded. Indeed our ancestors were willing to put any thing into the king's power, rather than their arms, and the garrisons of their towns; conceiving that to be neither better nor worse, than betraying their liberty to the fury and exorbitancy of their princes. Of which there are so very many instances in our histories, and those so generally known, that it would be superfluous to mention any of them here. But "the king owes protection to his subjects; and how can he protect them, unless he have men and arms at command?" But, say I, he had all this for the good of the kingdom, as has been said, not for the destruction of his people, and the ruin of the kingdom: Which in king Henry the III's time, one Leonard, a learned man in those days, in an assembly of bishops, told Rustandus, the pope's nuncio and the king's procurator in these words; 'All churches are the pope's, as all temporal things are said to be the king's, for defence and protection, not his in propriety and ownership, as we say; they are his to defend, not to destroy.' The aforementioned law of St. Edward, is to the same purpose; and what does this import more than a trust? Does this look like absolute power? Such a kind of power a commander of an army always has, that is, a delegated power; and yet both at home and abroad he is never the less able to defend the people that chuse him. Our parliaments would anciently have contended with our kings about their liberty and the laws of St. Edward, to very little purpose; and it would have been an unequal match betwixt the kings and them, if they had been of opinion, that the power of the sword belonged to him alone: for how unjust laws soever their kings would have imposed upon them, their Charter, though never so great, would have been a weak defence against force. But say you, "What would the parliament be the better for the militia, since without the king's assent they cannot raise the least farthing from the people towards the maintaining it?" Take you no thought for that: For in the first place you go upon a false supposition, "that parliaments cannot impose taxes without the king's assent," upon the people that send them, and whose concerns they undertake. In the next place, you that are so officious an enquirer into other mens matters, cannot but have heard, that the people of their own accord, by bringing in their plate to be melted down, raised a great sum of money towards the carrying on of this war against the king. Then you mention the largeness of our king's revenue: You mention over and over again five hundred and forty thousands: That "those of our kings that have been eminent for their bounty and liberality, have used to give large boons out of their own patrimony." This you were glad to hear;
it

it was by this charm, that those traitors to their country allured you, as Balaam the prophet was enticed of old, to curse the people of God, and exclaim against the judicial dispensations of his providence. You fool! what was that unjust and violent king the better for such abundance of wealth? What are you the better for it? Who have been no partaker of any part of it, that I can hear of (how great hopes soever you may have conceived of being vastly enriched by it) but only of a hundred pieces of gold, in a purse wrought with beads. Take that reward of thine iniquity, Balaam, which thou hast loved, and enjoy it. You go on to play the fool; "the setting up of a standard is a prerogative that belongs to the king only." How so? Why because Virgil tells us in his *Æneis*, 'that Turnus set up a standard on the top of the tower at Laurentum, for an ensign of war.' And do not you know, Grammarian, that every general of an army does the same thing? But, says Aristotle, 'The king must always be provided of a military power, that he may be able to defend the laws; and therefore the king must be stronger than the whole body of the people.' This man makes consequences just as Ocnus does ropes in hell; which are of no use but to be eaten by asses. For a number of soldiers given to the king by the people, is one thing; and the sole power of the militia is quite another thing; the latter, Aristotle does not allow that kings ought to be masters of, and that in this very place which you have quoted: 'He ought,' says he, 'to have so many armed men about him, as to make him stronger than any one man, than many men got together; but he must not be stronger than all the people.' *Polit. lib. 3. cap. 4.* Else instead of protecting them, it would be in his power to subject both people and laws to himself. For this is the difference betwixt a king and a tyrant: A king, by consent of the senate and people, has about him so many armed men, as to enable him to resist enemies, and suppress seditions. A tyrant, against the will both of senate and people, gets as great a number as he can, either of enemies, or profligate subjects, to side with him against the senate and the people. The parliament therefore allowed the king, as they did whatever he had besides, the setting up of a Standard; not to wage war against his own people, but to defend them against such as the parliament should declare enemies to the state: If he acted otherwise, himself was to be accounted an enemy; since according to the very law of St. Edward, or according to a more sacred law than that, the law of nature itself, he lost the name of a king, and was no longer such. Whence Cicero in his *Philip*. 'He forfeits his command in the army, and interest in his government, that employs them against the state.' Neither could the king compel those that held of him by knight-service, to serve him in any other war, than such as was made by consent of parliament; which is evident by many statutes. So for customs and other subsidies for the maintenance of the navy, the king could not exact them without an act of parliament; as was resolved about twelve years ago, by the ablest of our lawyers, when the king's authority was at the height. And long before them, Fortescue, an eminent lawyer, and chancellor to king Henry the Sixth, 'The king of England,' says he, 'can neither alter the laws, nor exact subsidies without the people's consent.' Nor can any testimonies be brought from antiquity, to prove the kingdom of England to have been merely regal. 'The king,' says Bracton, has a jurisdiction over all his subjects; that is, in his courts of justice, where justice is administered in the king's name indeed, but according to our own laws. 'All are subject to the king;' that is, every particular man is; and so Bracton explains himself in the places that I have cited. What follows is but turning the same stone over and over again; (at which sport I believe you are able to tire Sisyphus himself) and is sufficiently answered by what has been said already. For the rest, if our parliaments have sometimes complimented good kings with submissive expressions, tho' neither favouring of flattery nor slavery, those are not to be accounted due to tyrants, nor ought to prejudice the people's right: good manners and civility do not infringe liberty. Whereas you cite out of Sir Edward Coke and others, 'that the kingdom of England is an absolute kingdom;' that is said with respect

spect to any foreign prince, or the emperor; because as Cambden says, 'It is not under the patronage of the emperor: but both of them affirm that the government of England resides not in the king alone, but in a body politic.' Whence Fortescue, in his book de Laud. Leg. Ang. cap. 9. 'The king of England,' says he, 'governs his people, not by a merely regal, but a political power; for the English are governed by laws of their own making.' Foreign authors were not ignorant of this: Hence Philip de Comines, a grave author, in the Fifth Book of his Commentaries, 'Of all the kingdoms of the earth,' says he, 'that I have any knowledge of, there is none in my opinion, where the government is more moderate, where the king has less power of hurting his people, than in England.' Finally, "It is ridiculous," say you, "for them to affirm that kingdoms were ancients than kings; which is as much as if they should say, that there was light before the sun was created." But with your good leave, Sir, we do not say that kingdoms, but that the people were before kings. In the mean time, who can be more ridiculous than you, who deny there was light before the sun had a being? You pretend to a curiosity in other men's matters, and have forgot the very first things that were taught you. "You wonder how they that have seen the king sit upon his throne, at a session of parliament (*sub aureo & serico Coelo*, under a golden and silken heaven) under a canopy of state, should so much as make a question whether the majesty resided in him, or in the parliament?" They are certainly hard of belief, whom so lucid an argument coming down from heaven, cannot convince. Which golden heaven, you, like a stoic, have so devoutly and seriously gazed upon, that you seem to have forgot what kind of heaven Moses and Aristotle describe to us; for you deny that there was any light in Moses's heaven before the sun; and in Aristotle's you make three temperate zones. How many zones you observed in that golden and silken heaven of the king's, I know not; but I know you got one zone (a purse) well tempered with a hundred golden stars by your astronomy.

C H A P. X.

SINCE this whole controversy, whether concerning the right of kings in general, or that of the king of England in particular, is rendered difficult and intricate, rather by the obstinacy of parties, than by the nature of the thing itself; I hope they that prefer truth before the interest of a faction, will be satisfied with what I have alledged out of the law of God, the laws of nations, and the municipal laws of my own country, that a king of England may be brought to trial, and put to death. As for those whose minds are either blinded with superstition, or so dazzled with the splendor and grandeur of a court, that magnanimity and true liberty do not appear so glorious to them, as they are in themselves, it will be in vain to contend with them, either by reason and arguments, or examples. But you, Salmasius, seem very absurd, as in every other part of your book, so particularly in this, who tho' you rail perpetually at the Independents, and revile them with all the terms of reproach imaginable, yet assert to the highest degree that can be, the Independency of a king, whom you defend; and will not allow him to "owe his sovereignty to the people, but to his descent." And whereas in the beginning of your book you complained that he was "put to plead for his life," here you complain, "that he perished without being heard to speak for himself." But if you have a mind to look into the history of his trial, which is very faithfully published in French, it may be you'll be of another opinion. Whereas he had liberty given him for some days together, to say what he could for himself, he made use of it not to clear himself of the crimes laid to his charge, but to disprove the authority of his judges, and the judicature that he was called before. And whenever a criminal is either mute, or says nothing to the purpose, there is no injustice in condemning him without hearing him, if his crimes are notorious, and publickly known. If you say that Charles died as he lived, I agree with you: If you
say

say that he died piously, holily, and at ease, you may remember that his grandmother Mary, queen of Scots, an infamous woman, died on a scaffold with as much outward appearance of piety, sanctity, and constancy, as he did. And lest you should ascribe too much to that presence of mind which some common malefactors have so great a measure of at their death; many times despair, and a hardened heart puts on as it were a vizard of courage; and stupidity, a shew of quiet and tranquillity of mind: Sometimes the worst of men desire to appear good, undaunted, innocent, and now and then religious, not only in their life, but at their death; and in suffering death for their villainies, use to act the last part of their hypocrisy and cheats, with all the show imaginable; and like bad poets or stage-players, are very ambitious of being clapped at the end of the play. "Now," you say, "you are come to enquire who they chiefly were, that gave sentence against the king." Whereas it ought first to be enquired into, how you, a foreigner, and a French vagabond, came to have any thing to do to raise a question about our affairs, to which you are so much a stranger? And what reward induced you to it? But we know enough of that, and who satisfied your curiosity in these matters of ours; even those fugitives, and traitors to their country, that could easily hire such a vain fellow as you, to speak ill of us. Then an account in writing, of the state of our affairs, was put into your hands by some hair-brained, half protestant, half papist chaplain or other, or by some sneaking courtier, and you were put to translate it into Latin; out of that you took these narratives, which, if you please, we'll examine a little: "Not the hundred thousandth part of the people consented to this sentence of condemnation." What were the rest of the people then that suffered so great a thing to be transacted against their will? Were they stocks and stones, were they mere trunks of men only, or such images of Britains, as Virgil describes to have been wrought in tapestry?

Purpurea intexti tollunt aulea Britanni.

And Britains interwove held up the purple hangings.

For you describe no true Britains, but painted ones, or rather needle-wrought men instead of them. Since therefore it is a thing so incredible that a warlike nation should be subdued by so few, and those of the dregs of the people (which is the first thing that occurs in your narrative) that appears in the very nature of the thing itself to be most false. "The bishops were turned out of the house of lords by the parliament itself." The more deplorable is your madness (for are not you yet sensible that you rave) to complain of their being turned out of the parliament, whom you yourself in a large book endeavour to prove ought to be turned out of the Church. "One of the states of parliament, to wit, the house of lords, consisting of dukes, earls, and viscounts, was removed." And deservedly were they removed; for they were not deputed to sit there by any town or county, but represented themselves only; they had no right over the people, but (as if they had been ordained for that very purpose) used frequently to oppose their rights and liberties. They were created by the king, they were his companions, his servants, and as it were, shadows of him. He being removed, it was necessary they should be reduced to the same level with the body of the people, from amongst whom they took their rise. "One part of the parliament, and that the worst of all, ought not to have assumed that power of judging and condemning the king." But I have told you already, that the house of commons was not only the chief part of our parliament, while we had kings, but was a perfect and entire parliament of itself, without the temporal lords, much more without the bishops. But, "the whole house of commons themselves were not admitted to have to do with the trial of the king." To wit, that part of them was not admitted, that openly revolted to him in their minds and counsels; whom, tho' they stiled him their king, yet they had so often acted against, as an enemy. The parliament of England, and the deputies sent from

from the parliament of Scotland, on the 13th of January, 1645, wrote to the king, in answer to a letter of his, by which he desired a deceitful truce, and that he might treat with them at London; that they could not admit him into that city, till he had made satisfaction to the state for the civil war that he had raised in the three kingdoms, and for the deaths of so many of his subjects slain by his order; and till he had agreed to a true and firm peace upon such terms as the parliaments of both kingdoms had offered him so often already, and should offer him again. He on the other hand either refused to hear, or by ambiguous answers eluded their just and equal proposals, tho' most humbly presented to him seven times over. The parliament at last, after so many years patience, lest the king should overturn the state by his wiles and delays, when in prison, which he could not subdue in the field, and lest the vanquished enemy, pleased with our divisions, should recover himself, and triumph unexpectedly over his conquerors, vote that for the future they would have no regard to him, that they would send him no more proposals, nor receive any from him: After which vote, there were found even some members of parliament, who out of the hatred they bore that invincible army, whose glory they envied, and which they would have had disbanded, and sent home with disgrace, after they had deserved so well of their nation, and out of a servile compliance with some seditious ministers, finding their opportunity, when many, whom they knew to be otherwise minded than themselves, having been sent by the house itself to suppress the Presbyterians, who began already to be turbulent, were absent in the several counties, with a strange levity, not to say perfidiousness, vote that that inveterate enemy of the state, who had nothing of a king but the name, without giving any satisfaction or security, should be brought back to London, and restored to his dignity and government, as if he had deserved well of the nation by what he had done. So that they preferred the king before their religion, their liberty, and that very celebrated covenant of theirs. What did they do in the mean time, who were found themselves, and saw such pernicious councils on foot? Ought they therefore to have been wanting to the nation, and not provide for its safety, because the infection had spread itself even in their own house? But, who secluded those ill-affected members? "The English army," you say: So that it was not an army of foreigners, but of most valiant, and faithful, honest natives, whose officers for the most part were members of parliament; and whom those good secluded members would have secluded their country, and banished into Ireland; while in the mean time the Scots, whose alliance began to be doubtful, had very considerable forces in four of our Northern counties, and kept garrisons in the best towns of those parts, and had the king himself in custody; whilst they likewise encouraged the tumultuating of those of their own faction, who did more than threaten the parliament, both in city and country, and through whose means not only a civil, but a war with Scotland too shortly after brake out. If it has been always counted praise-worthy in private men to assist the state, and promote the public good, whether by advice or action; our army sure was in no fault, who being ordered by the parliament to come to town, obeyed and came, and when they were come, quelled with ease the faction and uproar of the king's party, who sometimes threatened the house itself. For things were brought to that pass, that of necessity either we must be run down by them, or they by us. They had on their side most of the shopkeepers and handicrafts-men of London, and generally those of the ministers, that were most factious. On our side was the army, whose fidelity, moderation, and courage were sufficiently known. It being in our power by their means to retain our liberty, our state, our common safety, do you think we had not been fools to have lost all by our negligence and folly? They who had had places of command in the king's army, after their party were subdued, had laid down their arms indeed against their wills, but continued enemies to us in their hearts; and they flocked to town, and were here watching all opportunities of renewing the war. With these men, tho' they were the greatest enemies they had in the world, and thirsted after their blood, did the Presbyterians, because they were not permitted to exercise a civil, as well as an ecclesiasti-

cal jurisdiction over all others, hold secret correspondence, and took measures very unworthy of what they had formerly both said and done; and they came to that spleen at last, that they would rather enthrall themselves to the king again, than admit their own brethren to share in their liberty, which they likewise had purchased at the price of their own blood; they chose rather to be lorded over once more by a tyrant, polluted with the blood of so many of his own subjects, and who was enraged, and breathed out nothing but revenge against those of them that were left, than endure their brethren and friends to be upon the square with them. The Independents, as they are called, were the only men, that from first to last kept to their point, and knew what use to make of their victory. They refused (and wisely, in my opinion) to make him king again, being then an enemy; who when he was their king, had made himself their enemy: Nor were they ever the less averse to a peace, but they very prudently dreaded a new war, or a perpetual slavery under the name of a peace. To load our army with the more reproaches, you begin a silly confused narrative of our affairs; in which, tho' I find many things false, many things frivolous, many things laid to our charge, for which we rather merit; yet I think it will be to no purpose for me to write a true relation, in answer to your false one. For you and I are arguing, not writing histories, and both sides will believe our reasons, but not our narrative; and indeed the nature of the things themselves is such, that they cannot be related as they ought to be, but in a set history; so that I think it better, as Salust said of Carthage, rather to say nothing at all, than to say but a little of things of this weight and importance. Nay, and I scorn so much as to mention the praises of great men, and of Almighty God himself (who in so wonderful a course of affairs ought to be frequently acknowledged) amongst your slanders and reproaches. I'll therefore only pick out such things as seem to have any colour of argument. You say, "the English and Scots promised by a solemn covenant, to preserve the majesty of the king." But you omit upon what terms they promised it; to wit, if it might consist with the safety of their religion and their liberty. To both which, religion and liberty, that king was so averse to his last breath, and watched all opportunities of gaining advantages upon them, that it was evident that his life was dangerous to their religion, and the certain ruin of their liberty. But then you fall upon the king's judges again: "If we consider the thing aright, the conclusion of this abominable action must be imputed to the Independents, yet so as the Presbyterians may justly challenge the glory of its beginning and progress." Hark, ye Presbyterians, what good has it done you? How is your innocence and loyalty the more cleared by your seeming so much to abhor the putting the king to death? You yourselves, in the opinion of this everlasting talkative advocate of the king, your "accuser, went more than half-way towards it; you were seen acting the fourth act and more, in this tragedy; you may justly be charged with the king's death, since you shewed the way to it; it was you and only you that laid his head upon the block." Wo be to you in the first place, if ever Charles his posterity recover the crown of England; assure yourselves, you are like to be put in the black list. But pay your vows to God, and love your brethren who have delivered you, who have prevented that calamity from falling upon you, who have saved you from inevitable ruin, tho' against your own wills. You are accused likewise for that "some years ago you endeavoured by sundry petitions to lessen the king's authority, that you published some scandalous expressions of the king himself in the papers you presented him with in the name of the parliament; to wit, in that declaration of the lords and commons of the 26th of May 1642, you declared openly in some mad positions that breathed nothing but rebellion, what your thoughts were of the king's authority: Hotham by order of parliament shut the gates of Hull against the king; you had a mind to make a trial by this first act of rebellion how much the king would bear." What could this man say more, if it were his design to reconcile the minds of all Englishmen to one another, and alienate them wholly from the king? for he gives them here to understand, that if ever the king be brought back, they must not only expect to be punished for his father's

death,

death, but for the petitions they made long ago, and some acts that past in full parliament, concerning the putting down the common-prayer and bishops, and that of the triennial parliament, and several other things that were enacted with the greatest consent and applause of all the people that could be; all which will be looked upon as the seditions and mad positions of the Presbyterians. But this vain fellow changes his mind all of a sudden; and what but of late, "when he considered it aright," he thought was to be imputed wholly to the Presbyterians, now that "he considers the same thing from first to last," he thinks the Independents were the sole actors of it. But even now he told us, "the Presbyterians took up arms against the king, that by them he was beaten, taken captive, and put in prison:" Now he says, "this whole doctrine of rebellion is the Independents principle." O! the faithfulness of this man's narrative! How consistent he is with himself! What need is there of a counter-narrative to this of his, that cuts its own throat? But if any man should question whether you are an honest man or a knave, let him read these following lines of yours: "It is time to explain whence and at what time this sect of enemies to kingship first began. Why truly these rare puritans began in queen Elizabeth's time to crawl out of hell, and disturb not only the church, but the state likewise; for they are no less plagues to the latter than to the former." Now your very speech bewrays you to be a right Balaam; for where you designed to spit out the most bitter poison you could, there unwittingly and against your will you have pronounced a blessing. For it is notoriously known all over England, that if any endeavoured to follow the example of those churches, whether in France or Germany, which they accounted best reformed, and to exercise the public worship of God in a more pure manner, which our bishops had almost universally corrupted with their ceremonies and superstitions; or if any seemed either in point of religion or morality to be better than others, such persons were by the favour of episcopacy termed Puritans. These are they whose principles you say are so opposite to kingship. Nor are they the only persons, "most of the reformed religion, that have not sucked in the rest of their principles, yet seem to have approved of those that strike at kingly government." So that while you inveigh bitterly against the Independents, and endeavour to separate them from Christ's flock, with the same breath you praise them; and those principles which almost every where you affirm to be peculiar to the Independents, here you confess have been approved of by most of the reformed religion. Nay, you are arrived to that degree of impudence, impiety and apostacy, that though formerly you maintained bishops ought to be extirpated out of the church root and branch, as so many pests and limbs of antichrist, here you say the king ought to protect them, for the saving of his coronation-oath. You cannot show yourself a more infamous villain than you have done already, but by abjuring the protestant reformed religion, to which you are a scandal. Whereas you tax us with giving a "toleration of all sects and heresies," you ought not to find fault with us for that; since the church bears with such a profligate wretch as you yourself, such a vain fellow, such a liar, such a mercenary slanderer, such an apostate, one who has the impudence to affirm, that the best and most pious of christians, and even most of those who profess the reformed religion, are crept out of hell, because they differ in opinion from you. I had best pass by the calumnies that fill up the rest of this chapter, and those prodigious tenets that you ascribe to the Independents, to render them odious; for neither do they at all concern the cause you have in hand, and they are such for the most part as deserve to be laughed at, and despised, rather than receive a serious answer.

C H A P. XI.

YOU seem to begin this eleventh chapter, Salmasius, though with no modesty, yet with some sense of your weakness and trifling in this discourse. For whereas you proposed to yourself to enquire in this place, by what authority sentence was given

against the king? you add immediately, which nobody expected from you, that "it is in vain to make any such enquiry; to wit, because the quality of the persons that did it, leaves hardly any room for such a question." And therefore as you have been found guilty of a great deal of impudence and sauciness in the undertaking of this cause, so since you seem here conscious of your own impertinence, I shall give you the shorter answer. To your question then; by what authority the house of commons either condemned the king themselves, or delegated that power to others; I answer, they did it by virtue of the supreme authority on earth. How they come to have the supreme power, you may learn by what I have said already, when I have refuted your impertinencies upon that subject. If you believed yourself that you could ever say enough upon any subject, you would not be so tedious in repeating the same things so many times over. And the house of commons might delegate their judicial power by the same reason, by which you say the king may delegate his, who received all he had from the people. Hence in that solemn league and covenant that you object to us, the parliaments of England and Scotland solemnly protest and engage to each other, to punish the traitors in such manner as "the supreme, judicial authority in both nations, or such as should have a delegated power from them," should think fit. Now you hear the parliaments of both nations protest with one voice, that they may delegate their judicial power, which they call the supreme; so that you move a vain and frivolous controversy about delegating this power. "But," say you, "there were added to those judges that were made choice of out of the house of commons, some officers of the army, and it never was known that soldiers had any right to try a subject for his life." I'll silence you in a very few words: You may remember that we are not now discoursing of a subject, but of an enemy; whom if a general of an army, after he has taken him prisoner, resolves to dispatch, would he be thought to proceed otherwise than according to custom and martial law, if he himself with some of his officers should sit upon him, and try and condemn him? An enemy to a state made a prisoner of war, cannot be looked upon to be so much as a member, much less a king in that state. This is declared by that sacred law of St. Edward, which denies that a bad king is a king at all, or ought to be called so. Whereas you say, it was "not the whole, but a part of the house of commons that tried and condemned the king," I give you this answer: The number of them, who gave their votes for putting the king to death, was far greater than is necessary, according to the custom of our parliaments, to transact the greatest affairs of the kingdom, in the absence of the rest; who since they were absent through their own fault (for to revolt to the common enemy in their hearts, is the worst sort of absence) their absence ought not to hinder the rest who continued faithful to the cause, from preserving the state; which when it was in a tottering condition, and almost quite reduced to slavery and utter ruin, the whole body of the people had at first committed to their fidelity, prudence and courage. And they acted their parts like men; they set themselves in opposition to the unruly wilfulness, the rage, the secret designs of an inveterate and exasperated king; they preferred the common liberty and safety before their own; they out-did all former parliaments, they out-did all their ancestors in conduct, magnanimity and steadiness to their cause. Yet these very men did a great part of the people ungratefully desert in the midst of their undertaking, tho' they had promised them all fidelity, all the help and assistance they could afford them. These were for slavery and peace, with sloth and luxury, upon any terms: Others demanded their liberty, nor would accept of a peace that was not sure and honourable. What should the parliament do in this case? Ought they to have defended this part of the people, that was sound, and continued faithful to them and their country, or to have sided with those that deserted both? I know what you will say they ought to have done. You are not Eurylochus, but Elpenor, a miserable enchanted beast, a filthy swine, accustomed to a sordid slavery even under a woman; so that you have not the least relish of true magnanimity, nor consequently of liberty which is the effect of it:

You

You would have all other men slaves, because you find in yourself no generous, ingenuous inclinations; you say nothing, you breathe nothing but what is mean and servile. You raise another scruple, to wit, "that he was the king of Scotland too, whom we condemned;" as if he might therefore do what he would in England. But that you may conclude this chapter, which of all others is the most weak and insipid, at least with some witty querk, "there are two little words," say you, "that are made up of the same number of letters, and differ only in the placing of them, but whose significations are wide asunder, to wit, Vis and Jus, (might and right.)" It is no great wonder that such a three-lettered man as you, (Fur a Thief) should make such a witticism upon three letters: It is the greater wonder (which yet you assert throughout your book) that two things so directly opposite to one another as those two are, should yet meet and become one and the same thing in kings. For what violence was ever acted by kings, which you do not affirm to be their right? These are all the passages that I could pick out of nine long pages, that I thought deserved an answer. The rest consists either of repetitions of things that have been answered more than once, or such as have no relation to the matter in hand. So that my being more brief in this chapter than in the rest, is not to be imputed to want of diligence in me, which, how irksome soever you are to me, I have not slackened, but to your tedious impertinence, so void of matter and sense.

C H A P. XII.

I Wish, Salmasius, that you had left out this part of your discourse concerning the king's crime, which it had been more advisable for your self and your party to have done; for I am afraid lest in giving you an answer to it, I should appear too sharp and severe upon him, now he is dead, and hath received his punishment. But since you chose rather to discourse confidently and at large upon that subject, I'll make you sensible, that you could not have done a more inconsiderate thing, than to reserve the worst part of your cause to the last, to wit, that of ripping up and enquiring into the king's crimes; which when I shall have proved them to have been true and most exorbitant, they will render his memory unpleasant and odious to all good men, and imprint now in the close of the controversy, a just hatred of you, who undertake his defence, on the readers' minds. Say you, "his accusation may be divided into two parts, one is conversant about his morals, the other taxeth him with such faults as he might commit in his public capacity." I'll be content to pass by in silence that part of his life that he spent in banqueting, at plays, and in the conversation of women; for what can there be in luxury and excess, worth relating? And what would those things have been to us, if he had been a private person? But since he would be a king, as he could not live a private life, for neither could his vices be like those of a private person. For in the first place, he did a great deal of mischief by his example: In the second place, all that time that he spent upon his lust, and his sports, which was a great part of his time, he stole from the state, the government of which he had undertaken. Thirdly and lastly, he squandered away vast sums of money, which were not his own, but the public revenue of the nation, in his domestic luxury and extravagance. So that in his private life at home he first began to be an ill king. But let us rather pass over to those crimes "that he is charged with on the account of misgovernment." Here you lament his being condemned as a tyrant, a traitor, and a murderer. That he had no wrong done him, shall now be made appear. But first let us define a tyrant, not according to vulgar conceits, but the judgment of Aristotle, and of all learned men. He is a Tyrant who regards his own welfare and profit only, and not that of the people. So Aristotle defines one in the tenth book of his Ethics, and elsewhere, and so do very many others. Whether Charles regarded his own or the people's good, these few things of many that I shall but touch upon, will evince. When his rents and other public revenues of the crown would
not

not defray the expences of the court, he laid most heavy taxes upon the people; and when they were squandered away, he invented new ones; not for the benefit, honour, or defence of the state, but that he might hoard up, or lavish out in one house, the riches and wealth, not of one, but of three nations. When at this rate he broke loose, and acted without any colour of law to warrant his proceedings, knowing that the parliament was the only thing that could give him check, he endeavoured either wholly to lay aside the very calling of parliaments, or calling them just as often, and no oftner, than to serve his own turn, to make them entirely at his devotion. Which bridle when he had cast off himself, he put another bridle upon the people; he put garrisons of German horse and Irish foot in many towns and cities, and that in time of peace. Do you think he does not begin to look like a tyrant? In which very thing, as in many other particulars, which you have formerly given me occasion to instance, though you scorn to have Charles compared with so cruel a tyrant as Nero, he resembled him extremely much. For Nero likewise often threatened to take away the senate. Besides, he bore extreme hard upon the consciences of good men, and compelled them to the use of ceremonies and superstitious worship, borrowed from popery, and by him re-introduced into the church. They that would not conform, were imprisoned or banished. He made war upon the Scots twice for no other cause than that. By all these actions he has surely deserved the name of a tyrant once over at least. Now I will tell you why the word traitor was put into his indictment: When he assured his parliament by promises, by proclamations, by imprecations, that he had no design against the state, at that very time did he lift Papists in Ireland, he sent a private embassy to the king of Denmark to beg assistance from him of arms, horses and men, expressly against the parliament; and was endeavouring to raise an army first in England, and then in Scotland. To the English he promised the plunder of the city of London; to the Scots, that the four Northern counties should be added to Scotland, if they would but help him to get rid of the parliament; by what means soever. These projects not succeeding, he sent over one Dillon a traitor, into Ireland with private instructions to the natives, to fall suddenly upon all the English that inhabited there. These are the most remarkable instances of his treasons, not taken up upon hear-say and idle reports, but discovered by letters under his own hand and seal. And finally I suppose no man will deny that he was a murderer, by whose order the Irish took arms, and put to death with most exquisite torments, above a hundred thousand English, who lived peaceably by them, and without any apprehension of danger; and who raised so great a civil war in the other two kingdoms. Add to all this, that at the treaty in the Isle of Wight, the king openly took upon himself the guilt of the war, and cleared the parliament in the confession he made there, which is publickly known. Thus you have in short why king Charles was adjudged a Tyrant, a Traitor, and a Murderer. "But," say you, "why was he not declared so before, neither in that solemn league and covenant, nor afterwards when he was delivered to them, either by the Presbyterians or the Independents, but on the other hand was received as a king ought to be, with all reverence?" This very thing is sufficient to persuade any rational man, that the parliament entred not into any councils of quite deposing the king, but as their last refuge, after they had suffered and undergone all that possibly they could, and had attempted all other ways and means. You alone endeavour maliciously to lay that to their charge, which to all good men cannot but evidence their great patience, moderation, and perhaps a too long forbearing with the king's pride and arrogance. But "in the month of August, before the king suffered, the house of commons, which then bore the only sway, and was governed by the Independents, wrote letters to the Scots, in which they acquainted them that they never intended to alter the form of government that had obtained so long in England under king, lords, and commons." You may see from hence, how little reason there is to ascribe the deposing of the king, to the principles of the Independents. They, that never used to

dissemble

dissemble and conceal their tenets, even then, when they had the sole management of affairs, profess, "That they never intended to alter the government." But if afterwards a thing came into their minds, which at first they intended not, why might they not take such a course, though before not intended, as appeared most adviseable, and most for the nation's interest? Especially when they found that the king could not possibly be intreated or induced to assent to those just demands that they had made from time to time, and which were always the same from first to last. He persisted in those perverse sentiments with respect to religion and his own right, which he had all along espoused, and which were so destructive to us; not in the least altered from the man that he was, when in peace and war, he did us all so much mischief. If he assented to any thing, he gave no obscure hints that he did it against his will, and that whenever he should come into power again, he would look upon such his assent as null and void. The same thing his son declared by writing under his hand, when in those days he run away with part of the fleet, and so did the king himself by letters to some of his own party in London. In the mean time, against the avowed sense of the parliament, he struck up a private peace with the Irish, the most barbarous enemies imaginable to England, upon base dishonourable terms; but whenever he invited the English to treaties of peace, at those very times with all the power he had, and interest he could make, he was preparing for war. In this case, what should they do, who were entrusted with the care of the government? Ought they to have betrayed the safety of us all to our most bitter adversary? Or would you have had them left us to undergo the calamities of another seven years war, not to say worse? God put a better mind into them, of preferring, pursuant to that very solemn league and covenant, their religion, and liberties, before those thoughts they once had, of not rejecting the king; for they had not gone so far as to vote it; all which they saw at last (though indeed later than they might have done) could not possibly subsist, as long as the king continued king. The parliament ought and must of necessity be entirely free, and at liberty to provide for the good of the nation, as occasion requires; nor ought they so to be wedded to their first sentiments, as to scruple the altering their minds, for their own, or the nation's good, if God put an opportunity into their hands of procuring it. But "the Scots were of another opinion; for they, in a letter to Charles, the king's Son, call his father a most sacred prince, and the putting him to death, a most execrable villany." Do not you talk of the Scots, whom you know not; we know them well enough, and know the time, when they called that same king, a most execrable person, a murderer, and a traitor; and the putting a tyrant to death, a most sacred action. Then you pick holes in the king's charge, as not being properly penned; and you ask "why we needed to call him a traitor and a murderer, after we had stiled him a tyrant; since the word tyrant includes all the crimes that may be." And then you explain to us grammatically and critically, what a tyrant is. Away with those trifles, you pedagogue, which that one definition of Aristotle's, that has lately been cited, will utterly confound; and teach such a doctor as you, that the word tyrant (for all your concern is barely to have some understanding of words) may be applied to one, who is neither a traytor nor a murderer. But "the laws of England do not make it treason in the king to stir up sedition against himself or the people." Nor do they say, that the parliament can be guilty of treason by deposing a bad king, nor that any parliament ever was so, though they have often done it; but our laws plainly and clearly declare, that a king may violate, diminish, nay, and wholly lose his royalty. For that expression in the law of St. Edward, of "losing the name of a king," signifies neither more nor less, than being deprived of the kingly office and dignity; which befel Chilperic king of France, whose example for illustration sake, is taken notice of in the law itself. There is not a lawyer amongst us that can deny, but that the highest treason may be committed against the kingdom as well as against the king. I appeal to Glanville himself, whom you cite, 'If any man attempt to put the king to death, or
raise

raise sedition in the realm, it is high treason.' So that attempt of some papists to blow up the parliament-house, and the lords and commons there with gunpowder, was by king James himself, and both houses of parliament, declared to be High-Treason, not against the king only, but against the parliament and the whole kingdom. It would be to no purpose to quote more of our statutes, to prove so clear a truth; which yet I could easily do. For the thing itself is ridiculous, and absurd to imagine, that high treason may be committed against the king, and not against the people, for whose good, nay, and by whose leave, as I may say, the king is what he is: So that you babble over so many statutes of ours, to no purpose; you toil and wallow in our ancient law-books, to no purpose; for the laws themselves stand or fall by authority of parliament, who always had power to confirm or repeal them; and the parliament is the sole judge of what is rebellion, what high treason (*læsa Majestas*) and what not. Majesty never was vested to that degree in the person of the king, as not to be more conspicuous, and more august in parliament, as I have often shown: But who can endure to hear such a senseless fellow, such a French Mountebank as you, declare what our laws are? And, you English fugitives! so many bishops, doctors, lawyers, who pretend that all learning and ingenuous literature is fled out of England with yourselves, was there not one of you that could defend the king's cause and your own, and that in good Latin also, to be submitted to the judgment of other nations, but that this brain-sick, beggarly Frenchman, must be hired to undertake the defence of a poor indigent king, surrounded with so many infant-priests and doctors? This very thing, I assure you, will be a great imputation to you amongst foreigners; and you will be thought deservedly to have lost that cause you were so far from being able to defend by force of arms, as that you cannot so much as write in behalf of it. But now I come to you again, good-man Goosecap, who scribble so finely; if at least you are come to yourself again: for I find you here towards the latter end of your book, in a deep sleep, and dreaming of some voluntary Death or other, that is nothing to the purpose. Then you "deny that it is possible for a king in his right wits to embroil his people in seditions, to betray his own forces to be slaughtered by enemies, and raise factions against himself." All which things having been done by many kings, and particularly by Charles the late king of England, you will no longer doubt, I hope, especially being addicted to Stoicism, but that all tyrants, as well as profligate villains, are downright mad. Hear what Horace says, "Whoever through a senseless stupidity, or any other cause whatsoever, hath his understanding so blinded, as not to discern truth, the Stoics account of him as of a mad-man: And such are whole nations, such are kings and princes, such are all mankind; except those very few that are wise." So that if you would clear king Charles from the imputation of acting like a mad-man, you must first vindicate his integrity, and show that he never acted like an ill man. "But a king" you say, "cannot commit treason against his own subjects and vassals." In the first place, since we are as free as any people under heaven, we will not be imposed upon by any barbarous custom of any other nation whatsoever. In the second place, suppose we had been the king's vassals; that relation would not have obliged us to endure a tyrant to reign and lord it over us. All subjection to magistrates, as our own laws declare, is circumscribed, and confined within the bounds of Honesty, and the Public Good. Read Leg. Hen. I. Cap. 55. The obligation betwixt a lord and his tenants, is mutual, and remains so long as the lord protects his tenant; (this all our lawyers tell us) but if the lord be too severe and cruel to his tenant, and do him some heinous injury, "The whole relation betwixt them, and whatever obligation the tenant is under by having done homage to his lord, is utterly dissolved and extinguished." These are the very words of Bracton and Fleta. So that in some case, the law itself warrants even a slave, or a vassal to oppose his lord, and allows the slave to kill him, if he vanquish him in battle. If a city, or a whole nation may not lawfully take this course with a tyrant, the condition of freemen will be worse than that
of

of slaves. Then you go about to excuse king Charles's shedding of innocent blood, partly by murders committed by other kings, and partly by some instances of men put to death by them lawfully. For the matter of the Irish massacre, you refer the reader to *Ἐκων Βασιλική*; and I refer you to Eiconoclastes. The town of Rochel being taken, and the townsmen betrayed, assistance shown, but not afforded them, you will not have laid at Charles's door; nor have I any thing to say, whether he was faulty in that business or not; he did mischief enough at home; we need not enquire into what misdemeanors he was guilty of abroad. But you in the mean time would make all the protestant churches, that have at any time defended themselves by force of arms against princes, who were professed enemies of their religion, to have been guilty of rebellion. Let them consider how much it concerns them for the maintaining their ecclesiastical discipline, and asserting their own integrity, not to pass by so great an indignity offered them by a person bred up by and amongst themselves. That which troubles us most, is, that the English likewise were betrayed in that expedition. He, who had designed long ago to convert the government of England into a tyranny, thought he could not bring it to pass, till the flower and strength of the military power of the nation were cut off. Another of his crimes was, the causing some words to be struck out of the usual coronation-oath, before he himself would take it. Unworthy and abominable action! The act was wicked in itself; what shall be said of him that undertakes to justify it? For by the eternal God, what greater breach of faith, and violation of all laws, can possibly be imagined? What ought to be more sacred to him, next to the holy sacraments themselves, than that oath? Which of the two do you think the more flagitious person, him that offends against the law, or him that endeavours to make the law equally guilty with himself? Or rather him who subverts the law itself, that he may not seem to offend against it? For thus, that king violated that oath which he ought most religiously to have sworn to; but that he might not seem openly and publicly to violate it, he craftily adulterated and corrupted it; and lest he himself should be accounted perjured, he turned the very oath into a perjury. What other could be expected, than that his reign would be full of injustice, craft, and misfortune, who began it with so detestable an injury to his people? And who durst pervert and adulterate that law which he thought the only obstacle that stood in his way, and hindered him from perverting all the rest of the laws: But "that oath" (thus you justify him) "lays no other obligation upon kings, than the laws themselves do; and kings pretend that they will be bound and limited by laws, though indeed they are altogether from under the power of laws." Is it not prodigious, that a man should dare to express himself so sacrilegiously, and so senselessly, as to assert that an oath sacredly sworn upon the Holy Evangelists, may be dispensed with, and set aside as a little insignificant thing, without any cause whatsoever! Charles himself refutes you, you prodigy of impiety! who thinking that oath no light matter, chose rather by a subterfuge to avoid the force of it, or by a fallacy to elude it, than openly to violate it; and would rather falsify and corrupt the oath, than manifestly forswear himself after he had taken it. But, "The king indeed swears to his people, as the people do to him; but the people swear fidelity to the king, not the king to them." Pretty invention! Does not he that promises, and binds himself by an oath to do any thing to, or for another, oblige his fidelity to them that require the oath of him? Of a truth, every king swears Fidelity, and Service, and Obedience to the people, with respect to the performance of whatsoever he promises upon oath to do. Then you run back to William the Conqueror, who was forced more than once to swear to perform, not what he himself would, but what the people, and the great men of the realm required of him. If many kings "are crowned without the usual solemnity," and reign without taking any oath, the same thing may be said of the people; a great many of whom never took the oath of allegiance. If the king by not taking an oath be at liberty, the people are so too. And that part of the people that has sworn, swore not

to the king only, but to the realm, and the laws, by which the king came to his crown; and no otherwise to the king, than whilst he should act according to those laws, that "the common People," that is, the house of Commons, should chuse; (*quas vulgus elegerit*.) For it were folly to alter the phrase of our law, and turn it into more genuine Latin. This clause (*quas vulgus elegerit*) which the commons shall chuse, Charles before he was crowned, procured to be razed out. "But," say you, "without the king's assent the people can chuse no laws; and for this you cite two statutes, viz. Anno 37 H. VI. Cap. 15. and 13 Edw. IV. Cap. 8. but these two statutes are so far from appearing in our statute-books, that in the years you mention, neither of those kings enacted any laws at all. Go now and complain, that those fugitives who pretended to furnish you with matter out of our statutes, imposed upon you in it; and let other people in the mean time stand astonished at your impudence and vanity, who are not ashamed to pretend to be thoroughly versed in such books, as it is so evident you have never looked into, nor so much as seen. And that clause in the coronation-oath, which such a brazen-faced brawler as you call fictitious, "The king's friends," you say yourself, "acknowledge that it may possibly be extant in some ancient copies, but that it grew into disuse, because it had no convenient signification." But for that very reason, did our ancestors insert it in the oath, that the oath might have such a signification as would not be for a tyrant's conveniency. If it had really grown into disuse, which yet is most false, there was the greater need of reviving it; but even that would have been to no purpose, according to your doctrine: "For that custom of taking an oath, as kings now-a-days generally use it, is no more," you say, "than a bare ceremony." And yet the king, when the bishops were to be put down, pretended that he could not do it by reason of that oath. And consequently, that reverend and sacred oath, as it serves for the king's turn, or not, must be solemn and binding, or an empty ceremony: Which I earnestly entreat my countrymen to take notice of, and to consider what manner of a king they are like to have, if he ever come back. For it would never have entered into the thoughts of this rascally foreign Grammarian to write a discourse of the rights of the crown of England, unless both Charles Stuart now in banishment, and tainted with his father's principles, and those profligate tutors that he has along with him, had industriously suggested to him what they would have writ. They dictated to him, "That the whole parliament were liable to be proceeded against as traitors, because they declared without the king's assent all them to be traitors, who had taken up arms against the parliament of England; and that parliaments were but the king's vassals: That the oath which our kings take at their coronation, is but a ceremony:" And why not that a vassal too? So that no reverence of laws, no sacredness of an oath, will be sufficient to protect your lives and fortunes, either from the exorbitance of a furious, or the revenge of an exasperated prince, who has been so instructed from his cradle, as to think laws, religion, nay, and oaths themselves, ought to be subject to his will and pleasure. How much better is it, and more becoming yourselves, if you desire riches, liberty, peace and empire, to obtain them assuredly by your own virtue, industry, prudence and valour, than to long after, and hope for them in vain under the rule of a king? They, who are of opinion that these things cannot be compassed but under a king, and a lord, it cannot well be expressed how mean, how base, I do not say, how unworthy thoughts they have of themselves; for in effect, what do they other than confess, that they themselves are lazy, weak, senseless, silly persons, and framed for slavery both in body and mind? And indeed all manner of slavery is scandalous and disgraceful to a free-born ingenuous person; but for you, after you have recovered your lost liberty, by God's assistance, and your own arms; after the performance of so many valiant exploits, and the making so remarkable an example of a most potent king, to desire to return again into a condition of bondage and slavery, will not only be scandalous and disgraceful, but an impious and wicked thing; and
equal

equal to that of the Israelites, who for desiring to return to the Egyptian slavery, were so severely punished for that sordid, slavish temper of mind, and so many of them destroyed by that God who had been their deliverer. But what say you now, who would persuade us to become slaves? "The king," say you, "had a power of pardoning such as were guilty of treason, and other crimes; which evinces sufficiently that the king himself was under no law." The king might indeed pardon treason, not against the kingdom, but against himself; and so may any body else pardon wrongs done to themselves; and he might, perhaps, pardon some other offences, tho' not always. But does it follow, because in some cases he had the right of saving a malefactor's life, that therefore he must have a right to destroy all good men? If the king be impleaded in an inferior court, he is not obliged to answer, but by his attorney: Does it therefore follow, that when he is summoned by all his subjects to appear in parliament, he may chuse whether he will appear or no, and refuse to answer in person? You say, "That we endeavour to justify what we have done by the Hollanders example;" and upon this occasion, fearing the loss of that stipend with which the Hollanders feed such a murrain and pest as you are, if by reviling the English, you should consequently reflect upon them that maintain you, you endeavour to demonstrate "how unlike their actions and ours are." The comparison that you make betwixt them, I resolve to omit (though many things in it are most false, and other things flattery all over, which yet you thought yourself obliged to put down, to deserve your pension.) For the English think they need not alledge the examples of foreigners for their justification. They have municipal laws of their own, by which they have acted; laws with relation to the matter in hand, the best in the world: They have the examples of their ancestors, great and gallant men, for their imitation, who never gave way to the exorbitant power of princes, and who have put many of them to death, when their government became insupportable. They were born free, they stand in need of no other nation, they can make what laws they please for their own good government. One law in particular they have a great veneration for, and a very ancient one it is, enacted by nature itself, That all human laws, all civil right and government must have a respect to the safety and welfare of good men, and not be subject to the lusts of princes. From hence to the end of your book, I find nothing but rubbish and trifles, picked out of the former chapters; of which you have here raised so great a heap, that I cannot imagine what other design you could have in it, than to preface the ruin of your whole fabric. At last, after an infinite deal of tittle-tattle you make an end, calling "God to witness, that you undertook the defence of this cause, not only because you were desired so to do, but because your own conscience told you, that you could not possibly undertake the defence of a better." Is it fit for you to intermeddle with our matters, with which you have nothing to do, because you were desired, when we ourselves did not desire you? to reproach with contumelious and opprobrious language, and in a printed book, the supreme magistracy of the English nation, when according to the authority and power that they are intrusted with, they do but their duty within their own jurisdiction, and all this without the least injury or provocation from them? (for they did not so much as know that there was such a man in the world as you.) And I pray by whom were you desired? By your wife, I suppose, who, they say, exercises a kingly right and jurisdiction over you; and whenever she has a mind to it (as Fulvia is made to speak in that obscene epigram, that you collected some Centoes out of, Pag. 320.) cries, "Either write, or let's fight;" That made you write perhaps, lest the signal should be given. Or were you asked by Charles the younger, and that profligate gang of vagabond courtiers, and like a second Balaam called upon by another Balak to restore a desperate cause by ill writing, that was lost by ill-fighting? That may be; but there is this difference, for he was a wise understanding man, and rid upon an ass that could speak, to curse the people of God: Thou art a very talkative ass thyself, and rid by a woman, and being surrounded with the healed heads

of the bishops that heretofore thou hadst wounded, thou seemest to represent that beast in the Revelation. But they say that a little after you had written this book, you repented of what you had done. It is well if it be so; and to make your repentance public, I think the best course that you can take will be, for this long book that you have writ, to take a halter, and make one long letter of yourself. So Judas Iscariot repented, to whom you are like; and that young Charles knew, which made him send you the purse, Judas his badge; for he had heard before, and found afterward by experience, that you were an apostate and a devil. Judas betrayed Christ himself, and you betray his church; you have taught heretofore that bishops were Antichristian, and you are now revolted to their party. You now undertake the defence of their cause, whom formerly you damned to the pit of hell. Christ delivered all men from bondage, and you endeavour to enslave all mankind. Never question, since you have been such a villain to God himself, his church, and all mankind in general, but that the same fate attends you that befel your equal, out of despair rather than repentance, to be weary of your life, and hang yourself, and burst asunder as he did; and to send before-hand that faithless and treacherous conscience of yours, that railing conscience at good and holy men, to that place of torment that's prepared for you. And now I think, through God's assistance, I have finished the work I undertook, to wit, the defence of the noble actions of my countrymen at home and abroad, against the raging and envious madness of this distracted sophister; and the asserting of the common rights of the people against the unjust domination of kings, not out of any hatred to kings, but tyrants: Nor have I purposely left unanswered any one argument alledged by my adversary, nor any one example or authority quoted by him, that seemed to have any force in it, or the least colour of an argument. Perhaps I have been guilty rather of the other extreme, of replying to some of his fooleries and trifles, as if they were solid arguments, and thereby may seem to have attributed more to them than they deserved. One thing yet remains to be done, which perhaps is of the greatest concern of all, and that is, That you, my countrymen, refute this adversary of yours yourselves, which I do not see any other means of your effecting, than by a constant endeavour to out-do all men's bad words by your own good deeds. When you laboured under more sorts of oppression than one, you betook yourselves to God for refuge, and he was graciously pleased to hear your most earnest prayers and desires. He has gloriously delivered you the first of nations, from the two greatest mischiefs of this life, and most pernicious to virtue, tyranny and superstition; he has endued you with greatness of mind to be the first of mankind, who after having conquered their own king, and having had him delivered into their hands, have not scrupled to condemn him judicially, and pursuant to that sentence of condemnation, to put him to death. After the performing so glorious an action as this, you ought to do nothing that is mean and little, not so much as to think of, much less to do any thing but what is great and sublime. Which to attain to, this is your only way; as you have subdued your enemies in the field, so to make appear, that unarmed, and in the highest outward peace and tranquillity, you of all mankind are best able to subdue ambition, avarice, the love of riches, and can best avoid the corruptions that prosperity is apt to introduce, (which generally subdue and triumph over other nations) to shew as great justice, temperance and moderation in the maintaining your liberty, as you have shown courage in freeing yourselves from slavery. These are the only arguments by which you will be able to evince that you are not such persons as this fellow represents you, Traitors, Robbers, Murderers, Parricides, Madmen; that you did not put your king to death out of any ambitious design, or a desire of invading the rights of others, not out of any seditious principles or sinister ends; that it was not an act of fury or madness; but that it was wholly out of love to your liberty, your religion, to justice, virtue, and your country, that you punished a tyrant. But if it should fall out otherwise (which God forbid) if as you have been valiant in war, you should grow debauched

debauched in peace, you that have had such visible demonstrations of the goodness of God to yourselves, and his wrath against your enemies; and that you should not have learned by so eminent, so remarkable an example before your eyes, to fear God, and work righteousness; for my part, I shall easily grant and confess (for I cannot deny it) whatever ill men may speak or think of you, to be very true. And you will find in a little time, that God's displeasure against you, will be greater than it has been against your adversaries, greater than his grace and favour has been to yourselves, which you have had larger experience of, than any other nation under Heaven.

A
T R E A T I S E

O F

Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes :

S H E W I N G,

That it is not lawful for any Power on Earth to compel in Matters
of RELIGION. *

To the PARLIAMENT of the COMMONWEALTH of ENGLAND, with the
Dominions thereof.

I Have prepared, Supreme Council! against the much-expected time of your sitting, this treatise; which, though to all christian magistrates equally belonging, and therefore to have been written in the common language of Christendom, natural duty and affection hath confined, and dedicated first to my own nation; and in a season wherein the timely reading thereof, to the easier accomplishment of your great work, may save you much labour and interruption: of two parts usually proposed, civil and ecclesiastical, recommending civil only to your proper care, ecclesiastical to them only from whom it takes both that name and nature. Yet not for this cause only do I require or trust to find acceptance, but in a twofold respect besides: first, as bringing clear evidence of scripture and protestant maxims to the parliament of England, who in all their late acts, upon occasion, have professed to assert only the true protestant christian religion, as it is contained in the holy scriptures: next, in regard that your power being but for a time, and having in yourselves a christian liberty of your own, which at one time or other may be oppressed, thereof truly sensible, it will concern you while you are in power, so to regard other mens consciences, as you would your own should be regarded in the power of others; and to consider that any law against conscience is alike in force against any conscience, and so may one way or other justly redound upon yourselves. One advantage I make no doubt of, that I shall write to many eminent persons of your number, already perfect and resolved in this important article of christianity. Some of whom I remember to have heard often for several years, at a council next in authority to your own, so well joining religion with civil prudence, and yet so well distinguishing the different power of either; and this not only voting, but frequently reasoning why it should be so, that if any there present had been before of an opinion contrary, he might doubtless have departed thence a convert in that point, and have confessed, that then both commonwealth and religion will at length, if ever, flourish in Christendom, when either they who govern, discern between civil and religious, or they only who so discern shall be admitted to govern. Till then, nothing but troubles, persecutions,

* First printed 1659.

secutions, commotions can be expected; the inward decay of true religion among ourselves, and the utter overthrow at last by a common enemy. Of civil liberty I have written heretofore by the appointment, and not without the approbation of civil power: of christian liberty I write now, which others long since having done with all freedom under heathen emperors, I should do wrong to suspect, that I now shall with less under christian governors, and such especially as profess openly their defence of christian liberty; although I write this, not otherwise appointed or induced, than by an inward persuasion of the christian duty, which I may usefully discharge herein to the common lord and master of us all, and the certain hope of his approbation, first and chiefest to be sought: In the hand of whose providence I remain, praying all success and good event on your public councils, to the defence of true religion and our civil rights.

JOHN MILTON.

A Treatise of Civil power in Ecclesiastical causes.

TWO things there be which have been ever found working much mischief to the Church of God, and the advancement of truth; force on one side restraining, and hire on the other side corrupting the teachers thereof. Few ages have been since the ascension of our Saviour, wherein the one of these two, or both together, have not prevailed. It can be at no time therefore unseasonable to speak of these things; since by them the church is either in continual detriment and oppression, or in continual danger. The former shall be at this time my argument; the latter as I shall find God disposing me, and opportunity inviting. What I argue, shall be drawn from the Scripture only; and therein from true fundamental principles of the gospel, to all knowing christians undeniable. And if the governors of this commonwealth since the rooting out of prelates have made least use of force in religion, and most have favoured christian liberty of any in this island before them since the first preaching of the gospel, for which we are not to forget our thanks to God, and their due praise; they may, I doubt not, in this treatise find that which not only will confirm them to defend still the christian liberty which we enjoy, but will incite them also to enlarge it, if in aught they yet straiten it. To them who perhaps hereafter, less experienced in religion, may come to govern or give us laws, this or other such, if they please, may be a timely instruction: however, to the truth it will be at all times no unneedful testimony; at least some discharge of that general duty which no christian but according to what he hath received, knows is required of him, if he have aught more conducing to the advancement of religion than what is usually endeavoured, freely to impart it.

It will require no great labour of exposition to unfold what is here meant by matters of religion; being as soon apprehended as defined, such things as belong chiefly to the knowledge and service of God: and are either above the reach and light of nature without revelation from above, and therefore liable to be variously understood by human reason, or such things as are enjoined or forbidden by divine precept, which else by the light of reason would seem indifferent to be done or not done; and so likewise must needs appear to every man as the precept is understood. Whence I here mean by conscience or religion, that full persuasion whereby we are assured that our belief and practice, as far as we are able to apprehend and probably make appear, is according to the will of God and his holy spirit within us, which we ought to follow much rather than any law of man, as not only his word every where bids us, but the very dictate of reason tells us. Acts iv. 19. "Whether it be right in the sight of God, to hearken to you more than to God, judge ye." That for belief or practice in religion according to this conscientious persuasion, no man ought to be punished or molested by any outward force on earth whatsoever, I distrust not, through God's implored assistance, to make plain by these following arguments.

First, it cannot be denied, being the main foundation of our protestant religion, that we of these ages, having no other divine rule or authority from without us, warrantable to one another as a common ground, but the holy Scripture, and no other within us but the illumination of the holy spirit so interpreting that scripture as warrantable only to ourselves, and to such whose consciences we can so persuade, can have no other ground in matters of religion but only from the Scriptures. And these being not possible to be understood without this divine illumination, which no man can know at all times to be in himself, much less to be at any time for certain in any other, it follows clearly, that no man or body of men in these times can be the infallible judges or determiners in matters of religion to any other mens consciences but their own. And therefore those Bereans are commended, Acts xvii. 11. who after the preaching even of St. Paul, searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so." Nor did they more than what God himself in many places commands us by the same Apostle, to search, to try, to judge of these things ourselves: And gives us reason also, Gal. vi. 4, 5. "Let every man prove his own work, and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another: for every man shall bear his own burden." If then we count it so ignorant and irreligious in the papist to think himself discharged in God's account, believing only as the Church believes, how much greater condemnation will it be to the protestant his condemner, to think himself justified, believing only as the state believes? With good cause therefore it is the general consent of all sound protestant writers, that neither traditions, councils nor canons of any visible church, much less edicts of any magistrate or civil session, but the scripture only, can be the final judge or rule in matters of religion, and that only in the conscience of every christian to himself. Which protestation made by the first public reformers of our religion against the imperial edicts of Charles the fifth, imposing church-traditions without scripture, gave first beginning to the name of Protestant; and with that name hath ever been received this doctrine, which prefers the scripture before the church, and acknowledges none but the scripture sole interpreter of itself to the conscience. For if the church be not sufficient to be implicitly believed, as we hold it is not, what can there else be named of more authority than the church but the conscience, than which God only is greater, 1 John iii. 20? But if any man shall pretend, that the scripture judges to his conscience for other men, he makes himself greater not only than the church, but also than the scripture, than the consciences of other men: a presumption too high for any mortal, since every true christian, able to give a reason of his faith, hath the word of God before him, the promised holy spirit, and the mind of Christ within him, 1 Cor. ii. 16. a much better and safer guide of conscience, which as far as concerns himself he may far more certainly know than any outward rule imposed upon him by others whom he inwardly neither knows nor can know; at least knows nothing of them more sure than this one thing, that they cannot be his judges in religion. 1 Cor. ii. 15. "The spiritual man judgeth all things, but he himself is judged of no man." Chiefly for this cause do all true protestants account the pope antichrist, for that he assumes to himself this infallibility over both the conscience and the scripture; "sitting in the temple of God," as it were opposite to God, "and exalting himself above all that is called God, or is worshipped," 2 Thess. ii. 4. That is to say, not only above all judges and magistrates, who though they be called Gods, are far beneath infallible; but also above God himself, by giving law both to the scripture, to the conscience, and to the spirit itself of God within us. Whenas we find, James iv. 12. "There is one law-giver, who is able to save and to destroy: Who art thou that judgest another?" That Christ is the only lawgiver of his church, and that it is here meant in religious matters, no well grounded christian will deny. Thus also St. Paul, Rom. xiv. 4. "Who art thou that judgest the servant of another? to his own lord he standeth or falleth: but he shall stand; for God is able to make him stand." As therefore of one beyond expression bold and presumptuous, both these Apostles demand, "Who art thou," that presumest to im-

impose other law or judgment in religion than the only lawgiver and judge Christ, who only can save and destroy, gives to the conscience? And the forecited place to the Thessalonians by compared effects resolves us, that be he or they who or wherever they be or can be, they are of far less authority than the church, whom in these things as protestants they receive not, and yet no less antichrist in this main point of antichristianism, no less a pope or popedom than he at Rome, if not much more, by setting up supreme interpreters of scripture either those doctors whom they follow, or which is far worse, themselves as a civil papacy assuming unaccountable supremacy to themselves, not in civil only, but in ecclesiastical causes. Seeing then that in matters of religion, as hath been proved, none can judge or determine here on earth, no not Church-governors themselves against the consciences of other believers, my inference is, or rather not mine but our Saviour's own, that in those matters they neither can command nor use constraint, lest they run rashly on a pernicious consequence, forewarned in that parable, Mat. xiii. from the 29th to the 31st verse: "Lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, gather ye together first the tares," &c. Whereby he declares that this work neither his own ministers nor any else can discerningly enough or judgingly perform without his own immediate direction, in his own fit season, and that they ought till then not to attempt it. Which is further confirmed 2 Cor. i. 24. Not that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy." If apostles had no dominion or constraining power over faith or conscience, much less have ordinary ministers, 1 Pet. v. 2, 3, "Feed the flock of God, &c. not by constraint, neither as being lords over God's heritage." But some will object, that this overthrows all church-discipline, all censure of errors, if no man can determine. My answer is, that what they hear is plain scripture, which forbids not church-sentence or determining, but as it ends in violence upon the conscience unconvinced. Let whoso will interpret or determine, so it be according to true church-discipline, which is exercised on them only who have willingly joined themselves in that covenant of union, and proceeds only to a separation from the rest, proceeds never to any corporal inforcement or forfeiture of money, which in all spiritual things are the two arms of antichrist, not of the true church; the one being an inquisition, the other no better than a temporal indulgence of sin for money, whether by the church exacted or by the magistrate; both the one and the other a temporal satisfaction for what Christ hath satisfied eternally; a popish commuting of penalty, corporal for spiritual: a satisfaction to man, especially to the magistrate, for what and to whom we owe none: these and more are the injustices of force and fining in religion, besides what I most insist on, the violation of God's express commandment in the gospel, as hath been shewn. Thus then, if church-governors cannot use force in religion, though but for this reason, because they cannot infallibly determine to the conscience without conviction, much less have civil magistrates authority to use force where they can much less judge; unless they mean only to be the civil executioners of them who have no civil power to give them such commission, no nor yet ecclesiastical, to any force or violence in religion. To sum up all in brief, if we must believe as the magistrate appoints, why not rather as the church? If not as either without conviction, how can force be lawful? But some are ready to cry out, what shall then be done to blasphemy? Them I would first exhort not thus to terrify and pose the people with a Greek word; but to teach them better what it is, being a most usual and common word in that language to signify any slander, any malicious or evil speaking, whether against God or man, or any thing to good belonging: Blasphemy or evil speaking against God maliciously, is far from conscience in religion, according to that of Mar. ix. 39. "There is none who doth a powerful work in my name, and can likely speak evil of me." If this suffice not, I refer them to that prudent and well-deliberated act, August 9. 1650. where the parliament defines blasphemy against God, as far as it is a crime belonging to civil judicature,

plenius ac melius chrysippo & crantore; in plain English, more warily, more judiciously, more orthodoxally than twice their number of divines have done in many a prolix volume: although in all likelihood they whose whole study and profession these things are, should be most intelligent and authentic therein, as they are for the most part, yet neither they nor these unerring always, or infallible. But we shall not carry it thus; another Greek apparition stands in our way, Heresy and Heretic; in like manner also railed at to the people as in a tongue unknown. They should first interpret to them, that Heresy by what it signifies in that language, is no word of evil note, meaning only the choice or following of any opinion good or bad in religion, or any other learning: and thus not only in heathen authors, but in the New Testament itself, without censure or blame; Acts xv. 5. "Certain of the heresy of the Pharisees which believed;" and xxvi. 5. "After the exactest heresy of our religion I lived a Pharisee." In which sense presbyterian or independent may without reproach be called a heresy. Where it is mentioned with blame, it seems to differ little from schism; 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19. "I hear that there be schisms among you, &c. for there must also heresies be among you," &c. Though some who write of heresy after their own heads, would make it far worse than schism; whenas on the contrary, schism signifies division, and in the worst sense; heresy, choice only of one opinion before another, which may be without discord. In apostolic times therefore, ere the scripture was written, heresy was a doctrine maintained against the doctrine by them delivered; which in these times can be no otherwise defined than a doctrine maintained against the light, which we now only have, of the scripture. Seeing therefore that no man, no synod, no session of men, though called the Church, can judge definitively the sense of scripture to another man's conscience, which is well known to be a general maxim of the protestant religion; it follows plainly, that he who holds in religion that belief, or those opinions which to his conscience and utmost understanding appear with most evidence or probability in the scripture, though to others he seem erroneous, can no more be justly censured for a heretic than his censurers; who do but the same thing themselves while they censure him for so doing. For ask them, or any protestant, which hath most authority, the Church or the Scripture? They will answer, doubtless, that the scripture: and what hath most authority, that no doubt but they will confess is to be followed. He then, who to his best apprehension follows the scripture, though against any point of doctrine by the whole church received, is not the heretic; but he who follows the church against his conscience and persuasion grounded on the scripture. To make this yet more undeniable, I shall only borrow a plain simile, the same which our own writers, when they would demonstrate plainest, that we rightly prefer the scripture before the church, use frequently against the papist in this manner. As the Samaritans believed Christ, first for the woman's word, but next and much rather for his own, so we the scripture: first on the church's word, but afterwards and much more for its own, as the word of God; yea, the church itself we believe then for the scripture. The inference of itself follows: if by the protestant doctrine we believe the scripture, not for the Church's saying, but for its own as the word of God, then ought we to believe what in our conscience we apprehend the scripture to say, tho' the visible church, with all her doctors, gainsay: and being taught to believe them only for the scripture, they who so do are not heretics, but the best protestants: and by their opinions, whatever they be, can hurt no protestant, whose rule is not to receive them but from the scripture: which to interpret convincingly to his own conscience, none is able but himself guided by the holy spirit; and not so guided, none than he to himself can be a worse deceiver. To protestants therefore, whose common rule and touchstone is the scripture, nothing can with more conscience, more equity, nothing more protestantly can be permitted, than a free and lawful debate at all times by writing, conference, or disputation of what opinion soever, disputable by scripture: concluding, that no man in religion is properly a heretic at this day, but he who maintains traditions or opinions not probable by scripture, who,

for

for aught I know, is the papist only; he the only heretic, who counts all heretics but himself. Such as these, indeed, were capitally punished by the law of Moses, as the only true heretics, idolaters, plain and open deserters of God and his known law: but in the gospel such are punished by excommunication only. Tit. iii. 10. "An heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject." But they who think not this heavy enough, and understand not that dreadful awe and spiritual efficacy which the Apostle hath expressed so highly to be in church-discipline, 2 Cor. x. of which anon, and think weakly that the church of God cannot long subsist but in a bodily fear, for want of other proof will needs wrest that place of St. Paul, Rom xiii. to set up civil inquisition, and give power to the magistrate both of civil judgment, and punishment in causes ecclesiastical. But let us see with what strength of argument; "let every soul be subject to the higher powers" First, how prove they that the Apostle means other powers than such as they to whom he writes were then under; who meddled not at all in ecclesiastical causes, unless as tyrants and persecutors? And from them, I hope, they will not derive either the right of magistrates to judge in spiritual things, or the duty of such our obedience. How prove they next, that he intitles them here to spiritual causes, from whom he withheld, as much as in him lay, the judging of civil? 1 Cor. vi. 1, &c. If he himself appealed to Cæsar, it was to judge his innocence, not his religion. "For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil:" then are they not a terror to conscience, which is the rule or judge of good works grounded on the scripture. But heresy, they say, is reckoned among evil works, Gal. v. 20. as if all evil works were to be punished by the magistrate; whereof this place, their own citation, reckons up besides heresy a sufficient number to confute them; "uncleanness, wantonness, enmity, strife, emulations, animosities, contentions, envyings;" all which are far more manifest to be judged by him than heresy, as they define it; and yet I suppose they will not subject these evil works, nor many more such-like, to his cognizance and punishment. "Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same." This shews that religious matters are not here meant; wherein, from the power here spoken of, they could have no praise: "For he is the minister of God to thee for good:" True; but in that office, and to that end, and by those means which in this place must be clearly found, if from this place they intend to argue. And how, for thy good by forcing, oppressing, and insnaring thy conscience? Many are the ministers of God, and their offices no less different than many: none more different than state and church-government. Who seeks to govern both, must needs be worse than any lord prelate, or church-pluralist; for he in his own faculty and profession, the other not in his own, and for the most part not thoroughly understood, makes himself supreme lord or pope of the church, as far as his civil jurisdiction stretches; and all the ministers of God therein, his ministers, or his curates rather in the function only, not in the government; while he himself assumes to rule by civil power things to be ruled only by spiritual: whenas this very chapter, verse 6. appointing him his peculiar office, which requires utmost attendance, forbids him this worse than church-plurality from that full and weighty charge, wherein alone he is "the minister of God, attending continually on this very thing." To little purpose will they here instance Moses, who did all by immediate divine direction; no nor yet Aza, Jehosaphat, or Josiah, who both might, when they pleased, receive answer from God, and had a commonwealth by him delivered them, incorporated with a national church, exercised more in bodily than in spiritual worship; so as that the church might be called a commonwealth, and the whole commonwealth a church: nothing of which can be said of christianity, delivered without the help of magistrates, yea, in the midst of their opposition; how little then with any reference to them, or mention of them, save only of our obedience to their civil laws, as they countenance good, and deter evil? which is the proper work of the magistrate, following in the same verse, and shews distinctly wherein he is the minister of

God, "a revenger to execute wrath on him that doth evil." But we must first know who it is that doth evil: the heretic they say among the first. Let it be known then certainly who is a heretic; and that he who holds opinions in religion professedly from tradition, or his own inventions, and not from scripture, but rather against it, is the only heretic: and yet though such, not always punishable by the magistrate, unless he do evil against a civil law, properly so called, hath been already proved, without need of repetition. "But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid." To do by scripture and the gospel, according to conscience, is not to do evil; if we thereof ought not to be afraid, he ought not by his judging to give cause: causes therefore of religion are not here meant. "For he beareth not the sword in vain." Yes, altogether in vain, if it smite he knows not what; if that for heresy, which not the church itself, much less he can determine absolutely to be so; if truth for error, being himself so often fallible, he, bears the sword not in vain only, but unjustly and to evil. "Be subject not only for wrath, but for conscience sake:" How for conscience sake, against conscience? By all these reasons it appears plainly that the Apostle in this place gives no judgment or coercive power to magistrates, neither to those then, nor these now, in matters of religion; and exhorts us no otherwise than he exhorted those Romans. It hath now twice befallen me to assert, through God's assistance, this most wrested and vexed place of scripture; heretofore against Salmasius, and regal tyranny over the state; now against Erastus, and state-tyranny over the church. If from such uncertain, or rather such improbable grounds as these, they endue magistracy with spiritual judgment, they may as well invest him in the same spiritual kind with power of utmost punishment, excommunication; and then turn spiritual into corporal, as no worse authors did than Chrysostom, Jerome, and Austin, whom Erasmus and others in their notes on the New Testament have cited, to interpret that cutting off which St. Paul wished to them who had brought back the Galatians to circumcision, no less than the amercement of their whole virility: and Grotius adds, that this concising punishment of circumcisers, became a penal law thereupon among the Visigoths: a dangerous example of beginning in the spirit to end so in the flesh; whereas that cutting off much likelier seems meant a cutting off from the church, not unusually so termed in scripture, and a zealous imprecation, not a command. But I have mentioned this passage, to shew how absurd they often prove, who have not learned to distinguish rightly between civil power and ecclesiastical. How many persecutions then, imprisonments, banishments, penalties, and stripes; how much bloodshed have the forcers of conscience to answer for, and protestants rather than papists! For the papist, judging by his principles, punishes them who believe not as the church believes, though against the scripture; but the protestant, teaching every one to believe the scripture, though against the church, counts heretical, and persecutes against his own principles, them who in any particular so believe as he in general teaches them; them who most honour and believe divine scripture, but not against it any human interpretation though universal; them who interpret scripture only to themselves, which by his own position, none but they to themselves can interpret: them who use the scripture no otherwise by his own doctrine to their edification, than he himself uses it to their punishing; and so whom his doctrine acknowledges a true believer, his discipline persecutes as a heretic. The papist exacts our belief as to the church due above scripture; and by the church, which is the whole people of God, understands the pope, the general councils, prelatical only, and the surnamed fathers: but the forcing protestant, though he deny such belief to any church whatsoever, yet takes it to himself and his teachers, of far less authority than to be called the church, and above scripture believed; which renders his practice both contrary to his belief, and far worse than that belief which he condemns in the papist. By all which, well considered, the more he professes to be a true protestant, the more he hath to answer for his persecuting than a papist. No protestant therefore, of what sect soever, following scripture only, which is the common sect wherein they

all agree, and the granted rule of every man's conscience to himself, ought by the common doctrine of protestants, to be forced or molested for religion. But as for popery and idolatry, why they also may not hence plead to be tolerated, I have much less to say. Their religion the more considered, the less can be acknowledged a religion; but a Roman principality rather, endeavouring to keep up her old universal dominion under a new name, and meer shadow of a catholic religion; being indeed more rightly named a catholic heresy against the scripture, supported mainly by a civil, and except in Rome, by a foreign power: justly therefore to be suspected, not tolerated by the magistrate of another country. Besides, of an implicit faith which they profess, the conscience also becomes implicit, and so by voluntary servitude to man's law, forfeits her christian liberty. Who then can plead for such a conscience, as being implicitly enthralled to man instead of God, almost becomes no conscience, as the will not free, becomes no will? Nevertheless, if they ought not to be tolerated, it is for just reason of state, more than of religion; which they who force, though professing to be protestants, deserve as little to be tolerated themselves, being no less guilty of popery, in the most popish point. Lastly, for idolatry, who knows it not to be evidently against all scripture, both of the Old and New Testament, and therefore a true heresy, or rather an impiety, wherein a right conscience can have nought to do; and the works thereof so manifest, that a magistrate can hardly err in prohibiting and quite removing at least the public and scandalous use thereof?

From the riddance of these objections, I proceed yet to another reason why it is unlawful for the civil magistrate to use force in matters of religion; which is, because to judge in those things, though we should grant him able, which is proved he is not, yet as a civil magistrate he hath no right. Christ hath a government of his own, sufficient of itself to all his ends and purposes in governing his church, but much different from that of the civil magistrate; and the difference in this very thing principally consists, that it governs not by outward force; and that for two reasons. First, Because it deals only with the inward man and his actions, which are all spiritual, and to outward force not liable. 2dly, To shew us the divine excellence of his spiritual kingdom, able, without worldly force, to subdue all the powers and kingdoms of this world, which are upheld by outward force only. That the inward man is nothing else but the inward part of man, his understanding and his will; and that his actions thence proceeding, yet not simply thence, but from the work of divine grace upon them, are the whole matter of religion under the gospel, will appear plainly by considering what that religion is; whence we shall perceive yet more plainly that it cannot be forced. What evangelic religion is, is told in two words, Faith and Charity, or Belief and Practice. That both these flow, either, the one from the understanding, the other from the will, or both jointly from both; once indeed naturally free, but now only as they are regenerate and wrought on by divine grace, is in part evident to common sense and principles unquestioned, the rest by scripture: Concerning our belief, "Mat. xvi. 17. Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." Concerning our practice, as it is religious, and not meerly civil, Gal. v. 22, 23. and other places, declare it to be the fruit of the spirit only. Nay, our whole practical duty in religion is contained in charity, or the love of God and our neighbour, no way to be forced, yet the fulfilling of the whole law; that is to say, our whole practice in religion. If then both our belief and practice, which comprehend our whole religion, flow from faculties of the inward man, free and unconstrainable of themselves by nature, and our practice not only from faculties endued with freedom, but from love and charity besides, incapable of force, and all these things by transgression lost, but renewed and regenerated in us by the power and gift of God alone; how can such religion as this admit of force from man, or force be any way applied to such religion, especially under the free offer of grace in the gospel, but it must forthwith frustrate and make of no effect, both the religion and the gospel? And that to compel outward profession, which they will say per-

haps

haps ought to be compelled, though inward religion cannot, is to compel hypocrisy, not to advance religion, shall yet, though of itself clear enough, be ere the conclusion further manifest. The other reason why Christ rejects outward force in the government of his church, is, as I said before, to shew us the divine excellence of his spiritual kingdom, able without worldly force to subdue all the powers and kingdoms of this world, which are upheld by outward force only: By which to uphold religion otherwise than to defend the religious from outward violence, is no service to Christ or his kingdom, but rather a disparagement, and degrades it from a divine and spiritual kingdom, to a kingdom of this world: which he denies it to be, because it needs not force to confirm it: John xviii. 36. "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews." This proves the kingdom of Christ not governed by outward force, as being none of this world, whose kingdoms are maintained all by force only: and yet disproves not that a christian commonwealth may defend itself against outward force, in the cause of religion as well as in any other; though Christ himself coming purposely to die for us, would not be so defended. 1 Cor. i. 27. "God hath chosen the weak things of the world, to confound the things which are mighty." Then surely he hath not chosen the force of this world to subdue conscience, and conscientious men, who in this world are counted weakest; but rather conscience, as being weakest, to subdue and regulate force, his adversary, not his aid or instrument in governing the church: 2 Cor. x. 3, 4, 5, 6. "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong-holds, casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ: And having in a readiness to avenge all disobedience." It is evident by the first and second verses of this chapter, and the apostle here speaks of that spiritual power by which Christ governs his church, how all-sufficient it is, how powerful to reach the conscience, and the inward man with whom it chiefly deals, and whom no power else can deal with. In comparison of which, as it is here thus magnificently described, how uneffectual and weak is outward force with all her boisterous tools, to the shame of those christians, and especially those churchmen, who to the exercising of church-discipline, never cease calling on the civil magistrate to interpose his fleshly force? An argument that all true ministerial and spiritual power is dead within them; who think the gospel, which both began and spread over the whole world for above three hundred years, under heathen and persecuting emperors, cannot stand or continue, supported by the same divine presence and protection, to the world's end, much easier under the defensive favour only of a christian magistrate, unless it be enacted and settled, as they call it, by the state, a statute or a state-religion; and understand not that the church itself cannot, much less the state, settle or impose one tittle of religion upon our obedience implicit, but can only recommend or propound it to our free and conscientious examination: unless they mean to set the state higher than the church in religion, and with a gross contradiction give to the state in their settling petition, that command of our implicit belief, which they deny in their settled confession, both to the state and to the church. Let them cease then to importune and interrupt the magistrate from attending to his own charge in civil and moral things, the settling of things just, things honest, the defence of things religious, settled by the churches within themselves; and the repressing of their contraries, determinable by the common light of nature; which is not to constrain or to repress religion probable by scripture, but the violaters and persecutors thereof: Of all which things he hath enough and more than enough to do, left yet undone; for which the land groans, and justice goes to wrack the while. Let him also forbear force where he hath no right to judge, for the conscience is not his province, lest a worse Woe arrive him, for worse offending than was denounced by our Saviour, Matth. xxiii. 23. against the Pharisees: Ye have forced the conscience, which was not

to be forced; but judgment and mercy ye have not executed; this ye should have done, and the other let alone. And since it is the counsel and set purpose of God in the gospel, by spiritual means which are counted weak, to overcome all power which resists him; let them not go about to do that by worldly strength, which he hath decreed to do by those means which the world counts weakness, lest they be again obnoxious to that saying which in another place is also written of the Pharisees, Luke vii. 30. "That they frustrated the counsel of God." The main plea is, and urged with much vehemence to their imitation, that the kings of Judah, as I touched before, and especially Josiah, both judged and used force in religion: 2 Chron. xxxiv. 33. "He made all that were present in Israel to serve the Lord their God:" an argument, if it be well weighed, worse than that used by the false prophet Shemaia to the high-priest, that in imitation of Jehoiada, he ought to put Jeremiah in the stocks, Jer. xxix. 24, 26, &c. for which he received his due denouncement from God. But to this besides I return a three-fold answer: First, That the state of religion under the gospel is far differing from what it was under the law; then was the state of rigour, childhood, bondage and works, to all which force was not unbefitting; now is the state of grace, manhood, freedom and faith, to all which belongs willingness and reason, not force: the law was then written on tables of stone, and to be performed according to the letter, willingly or unwillingly; the gospel, our new covenant, upon the heart of every believer, to be interpreted only by the sense of charity and inward persuasion: The law had no distinct government or governors of church and commonwealth, but the Priests and Levites judged in all causes, not ecclesiastical only, but civil, Deut. xvii. 8, &c. which under the gospel is forbidden to all church-ministers, as a thing which Christ their master in his ministry disclaimed, Luke xii. 14. as a thing beneath them, 1 Cor. vi. 4. and by many other statutes, as to them who have a peculiar and far differing government of their own. If not, why different the governors? Why not church-ministers in state-affairs, as well as state-ministers in church-affairs? If church and state shall be made one flesh again as under the law, let it be withal considered, that God who then joined them, hath now severed them; that which, he so ordaining, was then a lawful conjunction; to such on either side as join again what he hath severed, would be nothing now but their own presumptuous fornication. Secondly, the kings of Judah, and those magistrates under the law might have recourse, as I said before, to divine inspiration; which our magistrates under the gospel have not, more than to the same spirit, which those whom they force have oft-times in greater measure than themselves: and so, instead of forcing the christian, they force the Holy Ghost; and, against that wise forewarning of Gamaliel, fight against God. Thirdly, those kings and Magistrates used force in such things only as were undoubtedly known and forbidden in the law of Moses, idolatry and direct apostacy from that national and strict enjoined worship of God; whereof the corporal punishment was by himself expressly set down: But magistrates under the gospel, our free, elective and rational worship, are most commonly busiest to force those things which in the gospel are either left free, nay, sometimes abolished when by them compelled, or else controverted equally by writers on both sides, and sometimes with odds on that side which is against them. By which means they either punish that which they ought to favour and protect, or that with corporal punishment, and of their own inventing, which not they, but the church hath received command to chastise with a spiritual rod only. Yet some are so eager in their zeal of forcing, that they refuse not to descend at length to the utmost shift of that parabolical proof, Luke xiv. 16, &c. "Compel them to come in:" Therefore magistrates may compel in religion. As if a parable were to be strained through every word or phrase, and not expounded by the general scope thereof; which is no other here than the earnest expression of God's displeasure on those recusant Jews, and his purpose to prefer the Gentiles on any terms before them; expressed here by the word Compel. But how compels he? Doubtless no other way than

than he draws, without which no man can come to him, John vi. 44. and that is by the inward persuasive motions of his spirit, and by his ministers; not by the outward compulsions of a magistrate or his officers. The true people of Christ, as is foretold, Psal. cx. 3. "are a willing people in the day of his power;" then much more now when he rules all things by outward weakness, that both his inward power and their sincerity may the more appear. "God loveth a cheerful Giver: then certainly is not pleased with an uncheerful worshipper; as the very words declare of his evangelical invitations, Esa. lv. 1. "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come." John vii. 37. "If any Man thirsteth." Rev. iii. 18. "I counsel thee." And xxii. 17. "Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." And in that grand commission of preaching, to invite all nations, Mark xvi. 16. as the reward of them who come, so the penalty of them who come not, is only spiritual. But they bring now some reason with their force, which must not pass unanswered, that the church of Thyatira was blamed, Rev. ii. 20. for suffering the false "Prophets to teach and to seduce." I answer, That seducement is to be hindered by fit and proper means ordained in Church-discipline, by instant and powerful demonstration to the contrary; by opposing truth to error, no unequal match; truth the strong, to error the weak, though sly and shifting. Force is no honest confutation, but uneffectual, and for the most part unsuccessful, oft times fatal to them who use it: Sound doctrine diligently and duly taught, is of herself both sufficient, and of herself (if some secret judgment of God hinder not) always prevalent against seducers. This the Thyatirians had neglected, suffering against Church-discipline, that woman to teach and seduce among them: Civil Force they had not then in their power, being the Christian part only of that city, and then especially under one of those ten great persecutions, whereof this the second was raised by Domitian: Force therefore in these Matters could not be required of them who were under force themselves.

I have shewn that the civil power hath neither right, nor can do right, by forcing religious things: I will now shew the wrong it doth, by violating the fundamental privilege of the gospel, the new birth-right of every true believer, christian liberty: 2 Cor. iii. 17. "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Gal. iv. 26. "Jerusalem, which is above, is free; which is the mother of us all." And v. 31. "We are not Children of the Bond-woman, but of the free." It will be sufficient in this place to say no more of christian liberty, than that it sets us free not only from the bondage of those ceremonies, but also from the forcible imposition of those circumstances, place and time, in the worship of God: which though by him commanded in the old law, yet in respect of that verity and freedom which is evangelical, St. Paul comprehends both kinds alike, that is to say, both ceremony and circumstance, under one and the same contemptuous name of "weak and beggarly Rudiments," Gal. iv. 3, 9, 10. Col. ii. 8. with 16. conformable to what our Saviour himself taught, John iv. 21, 23. "Neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem. In Spirit and in Truth; for the father seeketh such to worship him:" that is to say, not only sincere of heart, for such he sought ever; but also, as the words here chiefly import, not compelled to place, and by the same reason, not to any set time; as his apostle by the same spirit hath taught us, Rom. xiv. 6, &c. "One man esteemeth one day above another; another, &c. Gal. iv. 10. Ye observe days and months, &c." Col. ii. 16. These and other such places in scripture the best and learnedest reformed writers have thought evident enough to instruct us in our freedom, not only from ceremonies, but from those circumstances also, though imposed with a confident persuasion of morality in them, which they hold impossible to be in place or time. By what warrant then our opinions and practices herein are of late turned quite against all other protestants, and that which is to them orthodoxal, to us becomes scandalous and punishable by statute, I wish were once again better considered; if we mean not to proclaim a schism in this point from the best and most reformed churches abroad. They who would seem more knowing, confess that these things are indifferent, but for
that

that very cause by the magistrate may be commanded. As if God of his special grace in the gospel had to this end freed us from his own commandments in these things, that our freedom should subject us to a more grievous yoke, the commandments of men. As well may the magistrate call that common or unclean which God hath cleansed, forbidden to St. Peter, Acts x. 15. as well may he loosen that which God hath streigthened, or streighten that which God hath loosened, as he may injoin those things in religion which God hath left free, and lay on that yoke which God hath taken off. For he hath not only given us this gift as a special privilege and excellence of the free gospel above the servile law, but strictly also hath commanded us to keep it and enjoy it. Gal. v. 13. "You are called to liberty." 1 Cor. vii. 23. "Be not made the servants of men." Gal. v. 14. "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free; and be not intangled again with the yoke of bondage." Neither is this a meer command, but for the most part in these forecited places, accompanied with the very weightiest and inmost reasons of Christian religion: Rom. xiv. 9, 10. "For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living. But why dost thou judge thy brother? &c." How presumest thou to be his Lord, to be whose only Lord, at least in these things, Christ both died, and rose, and lived again? "We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ." Why then dost thou not only judge, but persecute in these things for which we are to be accountable to the tribunal of Christ only, our Lord and law-giver? 1 Cor. vii. 23. "Ye are bought with a price; be not made the servants of men." Some trivial price belike, and for some frivolous pretences paid in their opinion, if bought and by him redeemed who is God from what was once the service of God, we shall be enthralled again, and forced by men to what now is but the service of men. Gal. iv. 31. with v. 1. "We are not children of the bond-woman, &c. stand fast therefore, &c. Col. ii. 8. Beware lest any man spoil you, &c. after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." Solid reasons whereof are continued through the whole chapter. Ver. 10. "Ye are compleat in him, which is the head of all principality and power:" Not compleated therefore or made the more religious by those ordinances of civil power, from which Christ their head hath discharged us; "blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us; and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross, ver. 14." blotting out ordinances written by God himself, much more those so boldly written over again by men: Ordinances which were against us, that is, against our frailty, much more those which are against our conscience. "Let no man therefore judge you in respect of, &c. v. 16. Gal. iv. 3. &c. Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the rudiments of the world: But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his son, &c. to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons, &c. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son, &c. But now, &c. how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly rudiments, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, &c." Hence it plainly appears, that if we be not free, we are not sons, but still servants unadopted; and if we turn again to those weak and beggarly rudiments, we are not free; yea, though willingly, and with a misguided conscience, we desire to be in bondage to them; how much more then if unwillingly and against our conscience? Ill was our condition changed from legal to evangelical, and small advantage gotten by the gospel, if for the spirit of adoption to freedom promised us, we receive again the spirit of bondage to fear; if our fear which was then servile towards God only, must be now servile in religion towards men: Strange also and preposterous fear, if when and wherein it hath attained by the redemption of our Saviour to be filial only towards God, it must be now servile towards the magistrate: Who by subjecting us to his punishment in these things, brings back into religion that law of terror and satisfaction belonging now only to civil crimes; and thereby in effect abolishes the gospel, by establishing again the law to a far worse yoke of servitude upon us than before. It will therefore not misbe-

come the meanest christian to put in mind christian magistrates, and so much the more freely by how much the more they desire to be thought christian, (for they will be thereby, as they ought to be in these things, the more our brethren and the less our Lords) that they meddle not rashly with christian liberty, the birth-right and outward testimony of our adoption; lest while they little think it, nay, think they do God service, they themselves, like the sons of that bond-woman, be found persecuting them who are free-born of the spirit, and by a sacrilege of not the least aggravation, bereaving them of that sacred liberty which our Saviour with his own blood purchased for them.

A fourth reason why the magistrate ought not to use force in religion, I bring from the consideration of all those ends which he can likely pretend to the interposing of his force therein: and those hardly can be other than first the glory of God; next, either the spiritual good of them whom he forces, or the temporal punishment of their scandal to others. As for the promoting of God's glory, none, I think, will say that his glory ought to be promoted in religious things by unwarrantable means, much less by means contrary to what he hath commanded. That outward force is such, and that God's glory in the whole administration of the gospel according to his own will and counsel ought to be fulfill'd by weakness, at least so refuted, not by force; or if by force, inward and spiritual, not outward and corporeal, is already proved at large. That outward force cannot tend to the good of him who is forced in religion, is unquestionable. For in religion whatever we do under the gospel, we ought to be thereof persuaded without scruple; and are justified by the faith we have, not by the work we do: Rom. xiv. 5. "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." The other reason which follows necessarily, is obvious, Gal. ii. 16. and in many other places of St. Paul, as the ground-work and foundation of the whole gospel, that we are "justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law." If not by the works of God's law, how then by the injunctions of man's law? Surely force cannot work persuasion, which is faith; cannot therefore justify nor pacify the conscience; and that which justifies not in the gospel, condemns; is not only not good, but sinful to do: Rom. xiv. 23. "Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin." It concerns the magistrate then to take heed how he forces in religion conscientious men: lest by compelling them to do that whereof they cannot be persuaded, that wherein they cannot find themselves justified, but by their own consciences condemned, instead of aiming at their spiritual Good, he force them to do evil; and while he thinks himself Aza, Josiah, Nehemiah, he be found Jeroboam, who caused Israel to sin; and thereby draw upon his own head all those sins and shipwracks of implicit faith and conformity, which he hath forced, and all the wounds given to those little ones, whom to offend he will find worse one day than that violent drowning mentioned Mat. xviii. 6. Lastly, as a preface to force, it is the usual pretence, That although tender consciences shall be tolerated, yet scandals thereby given shall not be unpunished, prophane and licentious men shall not be encouraged to neglect the performance of religious and holy duties by colour of any law giving liberty to tender consciences. By which contrivance the way lies ready open to them hereafter who may be so minded, to take away by little and little that liberty which Christ and his gospel, not any magistrate, hath right to give: though this kind of his giving be but to give with one hand, and take away with the other, which is a deluding, not a giving. As for scandals, if any man be offended at the conscientious liberty of another, it is a taken scandal, not a given. To heal one conscience, we must not wound another: and men must be exhorted to beware of scandals in christian liberty, not forced by the magistrate; lest while he goes about to take away the scandal, which is uncertain whether given or taken, he take away our liberty, which is the certain and the sacred gift of God, neither to be touched by him, nor to be parted with by us. None more cautious of giving scandal than St. Paul. Yet while he made himself "Servant to all," that he "might gain the more," he made himself so of his own accord, was not made so by outward force, testifying at the same time.

time that he "was free from all men, 1 Cor. ix. 19." and thereafter exhorts us also, Gal. v. 13. "Ye were called to liberty, &c. but by love serve one another:" then not by force. As for that fear, lest prophane and licentious men should be encouraged to omit the performance of religious and holy duties, how can that care belong to the civil magistrate, especially to his force? For if prophane and licentious persons must not neglect the performance of religious and holy duties, it implies, that such duties they can perform, which no protestant will affirm. They who mean the outward performance, may so explain it; and it will then appear yet more plainly, that such performance of religious and holy duties, especially by prophane and licentious persons, is a dishonouring rather than a worshipping of God; and not only by him not required, but detested: Prov. xxi. 27. "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination; how much more when he bringeth it with a wicked mind?" To compel therefore the prophane to things holy in his prophaneness, is all one under the gospel, as to have compelled the unclean to sacrifice in his uncleanness under the law. And I add withal, that to compel the licentious in his licentiousness, and the conscientious against his conscience, comes all to one; tends not to the honour of God, but to the multiplying and the aggravating of sin to them both. We read not that Christ ever exercised force but once; and that was to drive prophane ones out of his temple, not to force them in: and if their being there was an offence, we find by many other scriptures that their praying there was an abomination: and yet to the Jewish law that nation, as a servant, was obliged; but to the gospel each person is left voluntary, called only, as a son, by the preaching of the word; not to be driven in by edicts and force of arms. For if by the apostle, Rom. xii. 1. we are "beseeched as brethren by the mercies of God to present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is our reasonable service" or worship, then is no man to be forced by the compulsive laws of men to present his body a dead sacrifice; and so under the gospel most unholy and unacceptable, because it is his unreasonable service, that is to say, not only unwilling but unconscionable. But if prophane and licentious persons may not omit the performance of holy duties, why may they not partake of holy things? Why are they prohibited the Lord's supper, since both the one and the other action may be outward; and outward performance of duty may attain at least an outward participation of benefit? The church denying them that communion of grace and thanksgiving, as it justly doth, why doth the magistrate compel them to the union of performing that which they neither truly can, being themselves unholy, and to do seemingly is both hateful to God, and perhaps no less dangerous to perform holy duties irreligiously, than to receive holy signs or sacraments unworthily? All prophane and licentious men, so known, can be considered but either so without the church as never yet within it, or departed thence of their own accord, or excommunicate: If never yet within the church, whom the apostle, and so consequently the church, have nought to do to judge, as he professes, 1 Cor. v. 12. then by what authority doth the magistrate judge; or, which is worse, compel in relation to the church? If departed of his own accord, like that lost sheep, Luke xv. 4, &c. the true church either with her own or any borrowed force worries him not in again, but rather in all charitable manner sends after him; and if she find him, lays him gently on her shoulders; bears him, yea bears his burdens, his errors, his infirmities any way tolerable, "so fulfilling the law of Christ, Gal. vi. 2." If excommunicate, whom the church hath bid go out, in whose name doth the magistrate compel to go in? The church indeed hinders none from hearing in her public congregation, for the doors are open to all: nor excommunicates to destruction; but, as much as in her lies, to a final saving. Her meaning therefore must needs be, that as her driving out brings on no outward penalty, so no outward force or penalty of an improper and only a destructive power should drive in again her infectious sheep; therefore sent out because infectious, and not driven in but with the danger not only of the whole and sound, but also of his own utter perishing. Since force neither instructs in religion, nor

begets repentance or amendment of life, but on the contrary, hardness of heart, formality, hypocrisy, and, as I said before, every way increase of sin; more and more alienates the mind from a violent religion, expelling out and compelling in, and reduces it to a condition like that which the Britains complain of in our story, driven to and fro between the Picts and the sea. If after excommunication he be found intractable, incurable, and will not hear the church, he becomes as one never yet within her pale, "a Heathen or a Publican, Mat. xviii. 17. not further to be judged, no not by the magistrate, unless for civil causes; but left to the final sentence of that judge, whose coming shall be in flames of fire; that Maranathà, 1 Cor. xvi. 22. than which to him so left nothing can be more dreadful, and oft-times to him particularly nothing more speedy, that is to say, the Lord cometh: in the mean while delivered up to Satan, 1 Cor. v. 5. 1 Tim. i. 20. that is, from the fold of Christ and kingdom of grace to the world again, which is the kingdom of Satan; and as he was received "from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, Acts xxvi. 18. so now delivered up again from light to darkness, and from God to the power of Satan; yet so as is in both places manifested, to the intent of saving him, brought sooner to contrition by spiritual than by any corporal severity. But grant it belonging any way to the magistrate, that prophane and licentious persons omit not the performance of holy duties, which in them were odious to God even under the law, much more now under the gospel; yet ought his care both as a magistrate and a christian, to be much more that conscience be not inwardly violated, than that licence in these things be made outwardly conformable: since his part is undoubtedly as a christian, which puts him upon this office much more than as a magistrate, in all respects to have more care of the conscientious than of the prophane; and not for their sakes to take away (while they pretend to give) or to diminish the rightful liberty of religious consciences.

On these four scriptural reasons, as on a firm square, this truth, the right of christian and evangelic liberty, will stand immoveable against all those pretended consequences of licence and confusion, which for the most part men most licentious and confused themselves, or such as whose severity would be wiser than divine wisdom, are ever aptest to object against the ways of God: as if God without them, when he gave us this liberty, knew not of the worst which these men in their arrogance pretend will follow: yet knowing all their worst, he gave us this liberty as by him judged best. As to those magistrates who think it their work to settle religion, and those ministers or others, who so oft call upon them to do so, I trust, that having well considered what hath been here argued, neither they will continue in that intention, nor these in that expectation from them: when they shall find that the settlement of religion belongs only to each particular church by persuasive and spiritual means within itself, and that the defence only of the church belongs to the magistrate. Had he once learnt not further to concern himself with church-affairs, half his labour might be spared, and the commonwealth better tended. To which end, that which I premised in the beginning, and in due place treated of more at large, I desire now concluding, that they would consider seriously what religion is: and they will find it to be, in sum, both our belief and our practice depending upon God only. That there can be no place then left for the magistrate or his force in the settlement of religion, by appointing either what we shall believe in divine things, or practise in religious, (neither of which things are in the power of man either to perform himself, or to enable others) I persuade me in the christian ingenuity of all religious men, the more they examine seriously, the more they will find clearly to be true: and find how false and deceivable that common saying is, which is so much relied upon, that the christian magistrate is "*Custos utriusque Tabulæ*," Keeper of both Tables, unless is meant by keeper the defender only: neither can that maxim be maintained by any proof or argument which hath not in this discourse first or last been refuted. For the two tables, or ten commandments, teach our duty to God and our neighbour from

from the love of both; give magistrates no authority to force either: they seek that from the judicial law, though on false grounds, especially in the first table, as I have shewn; and both in first and second execute that authority for the most part, not according to God's judicial laws but their own. As for civil crimes, and of the outward man, which all are not, no not of those against the second table, as that of coveting; in them what power they have, they had from the beginning, long before Moses or the two tables were in being. And whether they be not now as little in being to be kept by any christian as they are two legal tables, remains yet as undecided, as it is sure they never were yet delivered to the keeping of any christian magistrate. But of these things perhaps more some other time; what may serve the present hath been above discoursed sufficiently out of the scriptures: and to those produced, might be added testimonies, examples, experiences of all succeeding ages to these times, asserting this doctrine: but having herein the scripture so copious and so plain, we have all that can be properly called true strength and nerve; the rest would be but pomp and incumbrance. Pomp and ostentation of reading is admired among the vulgar: but doubtless in matters of religion he is learnedest who is plainest. The brevity I use, not exceeding a small manual, will not therefore, I suppose, be thought the less considerable, unless with them perhaps who think that great books only can determine great matters. I rather choose the common rule, not to make much ado where less may serve. Which in controversies, and those especially of religion, would make them less tedious, and by consequence read oftner by many more, and with more benefit.

And whether any Maintenance of Ministers can be settled by Law.

To the PARLIAMENT of the COMMONWEALTH of ENGLAND, with the Dominions thereof.

WING to your protection, supreme senate! this liberty of writing which I have and these eighteen years on all occasions to assert the just rights and freedoms both of church and state, and so far approved, as to have been trusted with the representation and defence of your actions to all Christendom against an adversary of no mean repute, to whom should I address what I still publish on the same argument, but to you, whose magnanimous councils first opened and unbound the age from a dogmatic bondage under pretence of piety and royal tyranny: above our own hopes, hearing us to look up at last like men and christians from the slavish darkness wherein former ages were bred up and taught; and thereby deserving of these nations, if they be not barbarously ingrateful, to be acknowledged, next under God, the authors and best patrons of religious and civil liberty, that ever these islands brought forth? The cause and tuition of whole peace and safety, after a short, but scandalous night of interruption, is now again by a new drawing of God's miraculous Providence among us revolved upon your shoulders. And to whom more appertain these considerations which I propose, than to yourselves, and the debate before you, though I trail of no difficulty, yet as present of great expectation, not whether ye will grant, were it no more than so, but whether ye will bestow to the full portion of many thousands best affected both to religion and to this your return, or whether ye will deny, which you never can, the covetous pretences and demands of insatiable avarice, whose dissolution ye well know both to yourselves and your resolutions? That I, though among many others in this common

CONSIDERATIONS

Touching the Likeliest Means to remove

HIRELINGS

OUT OF THE

CHURCH.

Wherein is also discoursed

Of Tithes, Church-Fees, and Church-Revenues;

And whether any Maintenance of Ministers can be
settled by Law.*

To the PARLIAMENT of the COMMONWEALTH of ENGLAND, with the
Dominions thereof.

OWING to your protection, supreme senate! this liberty of writing which I have used these eighteen years on all occasions to assert the just rights and freedoms both of church and state, and so far approved, as to have been trusted with the representment and defence of your actions to all Christendom against an adversary of no mean repute; to whom should I address what I still publish on the same argument, but to you, whose magnanimous councils first opened and unbound the age from a double bondage under prelatical and regal tyranny: above our own hopes heartning us to look up at last like men and christians from the slavish dejection wherein from father to son we were bred up and taught; and thereby deserving of these nations, if they be not barbarously ingrateful, to be acknowledged, next under God, the authors and best patrons of religious and civil liberty, that ever these islands brought forth? The care and tuition of whose peace and safety, after a short, but scandalous night of interruption, is now again by a new dawning of God's miraculous Providence among us, revolved upon your shoulders. And to whom more appertain these considerations which I propound, than to yourselves, and the debate before you, though I trust of no difficulty, yet at present of great expectation, not whether ye will gratify, were it no more than so, but whether ye will hearken to the just petition of many thousands best affected both to religion and to this your return, or whether ye will satisfy, which you never can, the covetous pretences and demands of insatiable hirelings, whose disaffection ye well know both to yourselves and your resolutions? That I, though among many others in this common

con-

concernment, interpose to your deliberations what my thoughts also are, your own judgment and the success thereof hath given me the confidence: which requests but this, that if I have prosperously, God so favouring me, defended the public cause of this commonwealth to foreigners, ye would not think the reason and ability, whereon ye trusted once (and repent not,) your whole reputation to the world, either grown less by more maturity and longer study, or less available in English than in another tongue: but that if it sufficed some years past to convince and satisfy the uningaged of other nations in the justice of your doings, though then held paradoxal, it may as well suffice now against weaker opposition in matters, except here in England with a spirituality of men devoted to their temporal gain, of no controversy else among protestants. - Neither do I doubt, seeing daily the acceptance which they find who in their petitions venture to bring advice also, and new models of a commonwealth, but that you will interpret it much more the duty of a christian to offer what his conscience persuades him may be of moment to the freedom and better constituting of the church: since it is a deed of highest charity to help undeceive the people, and a work worthiest your authority, in all things else authors, assertors and now recoverers of our liberty, to deliver us, the only people of all protestants left still undelivered, from the oppressions of a simonious decimating clergy, who shame not, against the judgment and practice of all other churches reformed, to maintain, though very weakly, their popish and oft-refuted positions; not in a point of conscience, wherein they might be blameless, but in a point of covetousness and unjust claim to other men's goods; a contention foul and odious in any man, but most of all in ministers of the gospel, in whom contention, though for their own right, scarce is allowable. Till which grievances be removed, and religion set free from the monopoly of hirelings, I dare affirm, that no model whatsoever of a commonwealth will prove successful or undisturbed; and so persuaded, implore divine assistance on your pious counsels and proceedings to unanimity in this and all other truth.

JOHN MILTON.

C O N -

CONSIDERATIONS

TOUCHING

The likeliest Means to remove HIRELINGS

Out of the

CHURCH.

THE former treatise, which leads in this, began with two things ever found working much mischief to the church of God, and the advancement of truth; force on the one side restraining, and hire on the other side corrupting the teachers thereof. The latter of these is by much the more dangerous: for under force, though no thank to the forcers, true religion oft-times best thrives and flourishes; but the corruption of teachers, most commonly the effect of hire, is the very bane of truth in them who are so corrupted. Of force not to be used in matters of religion, I have already spoken; and so stated matters of conscience and religion in faith and divine worship, and so severed them from blasphemy and heresy, the one being such properly as is despiteful, the other such as stands not to the rule of scripture, and so both of them not matters of religion, but rather against it, that to them who will yet use force, this only choice can be left, whether they will force them to believe, to whom it is not given from above, being not forced thereto by any principle of the gospel, which is now the only dispensation of God to all men; or whether being protestants, they will punish in those things wherein the protestant religion denies them to be judges, either in themselves infallible, or to the consciences of other men; or whether, lastly, they think fit to punish error, supposing they can be infallible that it is so, being not wilful, but conscientious, and, according to the best light of him who errs, grounded on scripture: which kind of error all men religious, or but only reasonable, have thought worthier of pardon, and the growth thereof to be prevented by spiritual means and church-discipline, not by civil laws and outward force, since it is God only who gives as well to believe aright, as to believe at all; and by those means which he ordained sufficiently in his church to the full execution of his divine purpose in the gospel. It remains now to speak of hire, the other evil so mischievous in religion: whereof I promised then to speak further, when I should find God disposing me, and opportunity inviting. Opportunity I find now inviting; and apprehend therein the concurrence of God disposing; since the maintenance of Church-ministers, a thing not properly belonging to the magistrate, and yet with such importunity called for, and expected from him, is at present under publick debate. Wherein lest any thing may happen to be determined and established prejudicial to the right and freedom of church, or advantageous to such as may be found hirelings therein, it will be now most seasonable, and in these matters wherein every christian hath his free suffrage, no way misbecoming christian meekness to offer freely, without disparagement to the wisest, such advice as God shall incline him and enable him to propound: Since heretofore in commonwealths of most fame for government, civil laws were

were not established till they had been first for certain days published to the view of all men, that whoso pleased might speak freely his opinion thereof, and give in his exceptions, e'er the law could pass to a full establishment. And where ought this equity to have more place, than in the liberty which is inseparable from christian religion? This, I am not ignorant, will be a work unpleasing to some: but what truth is not hateful to some or other, as this, in likelihood, will be to none but hirelings. And if there be among them who hold it their duty to speak impartial truth, as the work of their ministry, though not performed without money, let them not envy others who think the same no less their duty by the general office of christianity, to speak truth, as in all reason may be thought, more impartially and unsuspectedly without money.

Hire of itself is neither a thing unlawful, nor a word of any evil note, signifying no more than a due recompence or reward; as when our Saviour saith, "the labourer is worthy of his hire." That which makes it so dangerous in the church, and properly makes the Hireling, a word always of evil signification, is either the excess thereof, or the undue manner of giving and taking it. What harm the excess thereof brought to the church, perhaps was not found by experience till the days of Constantine; who out of his zeal thinking he could be never too liberally a nursing father of the church, might be not unfitly said to have either over-laid it or choaked it in the nursing. Which was foretold, as is recorded in ecclesiastical traditions, by a voice heard from Heaven, on the very day that those great donations and church-revenues were given, crying aloud, "This day is poison poured into the church." Which the event soon after verified, as appears by another no less antient observation, "That religion brought forth wealth, and the daughter devoured the mother." But long e'er wealth came into the church, so soon as any gain appeared in religion, hirelings were apparent; drawn in long before by the very scent thereof. Judas therefore, the first hireling, for want of present hire answerable to his coveting, from the small number or the meanness of such as then were the religious, sold the religion itself with the founder thereof, his master. Simon Magus the next, in hope only that preaching and the gifts of the Holy Ghost would prove gainful, offered beforehand a sum of money to obtain them. Not long after, as the apostle foretold, hirelings like wolves came in by herds; Acts xx. 29. "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Tit. i. 11. Teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake. 2 Pet. ii. 3. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you." Yet they taught not false doctrine only, but seeming piety; 1 Tim. vi. 5. Supposing that gain is godliness. Neither came they in of themselves only, but invited oft-times by a corrupt audience: 2 Tim. iv. 3. "For the time will come, when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts they will heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears:" and they on the other side, as fast heaping to themselves disciples, Acts xx. 30. doubtless had as itching palms: 2 Pet. ii. 15. "Following the way of Balaam, the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness. Jude 11. They ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward." Thus we see that not only the excess of hire in wealthie times, but also the undue and vicious taking or giving it, though but small or mean, as in the primitive times, gave to hirelings occasion, though not intended, yet sufficient to creep at first into the church. Which argues also the difficulty, or rather the impossibility, to remove them quite, unless every minister were, as St. Paul, contented to teach Gratis; but few such are to be found. As therefore we cannot justly take away all hire in the church, because we cannot otherwise quite remove all hirelings, so are we not for the impossibility of removing them all, to use therefore no endeavour that fewest may come in; but rather, in regard the evil, do what we can, will always be incumbent and unavoidable, to use our utmost diligence how it may be least dangerous: which will be likeliest effected, if we consider, first, what recompence God hath ordained should be given to ministers of the church; (for that a recompence ought to be given them,

them, and may by them justly be received, our Saviour himself from the very light of reason and of equity hath declared, Luke x. 7. "The labourer is worthy of his hire;" next, by whom; and lastly, in what manner.

What recompence ought to be given to church-ministers, God hath answerably ordained according to that difference which he hath manifestly put between those his two great dispensations, the law and the gospel. Under the law he gave them tithes; under the gospel, having left all things in his church to charity and christian freedom, he hath given them only what is justly given them. That, as well under the gospel, as under the law, say our English divines, and they only of all protestants, is tithes; and they say true, if any man be so minded to give them of his own the tenth or twentieth; but that the law therefore of tithes is in force under the gospel, all other protestant divines, though equally concerned, yet constantly deny. For although hire to the labourer be of moral and perpetual right, yet that special kind of hire, the tenth, can be of no right or necessity, but to that special labour for which God ordained it. That special labour was the levitical and ceremonial service of the tabernacle, Numb. xviii. 21, 31. which is now abolished: the right therefore of that special hire must needs be withal abolished, as being also ceremonial. That tithes were ceremonial, is plain, not being given to the Levites till they had been first offered a heave-offering to the Lord, ver. 24, 28. He then who by that law brings tithes into the gospel, of necessity brings in withal a sacrifice, and an altar; without which tithes by that law were unsanctified and polluted, ver. 32, and therefore never thought on in the first christian times, till ceremonies, altars, and oblations, by an ancients corruption were brought back long before. And yet the Jews, ever since their temple was destroyed, though they have rabbies and teachers of their law, yet pay no tithes, as having no Levites to whom, no temple where to pay them, no altar whereon to hallow them: which argues that the Jews themselves never thought tithes, moral, but ceremonial only. That christians therefore should take them up, when Jews have laid them down, must needs be very absurd and preposterous. Next, it is as clear in the same chapter, that the priests and Levites had not tithes for their labour only in the tabernacle, but in regard they were to have no other part nor inheritance in the land, ver. 20, 24. and by that means for a tenth, lost a twelfth. But our Levites undergoing no such law of deprivation, can have no right to any such compensation: nay, if by this law they will have tithes, can have no inheritance of land, but forfeit what they have. Besides this, tithes were of two sorts, those of every year, and those of every third year: of the former, every one that brought his tithes, was to eat his share: Deut. xiv. 23. "Thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God, in the place which he shall chuse to place his name there, the tithe of thy corn, of thy wine, and of thine oil, &c." Nay, though he could not bring his tithe in kind, by reason of his distant dwelling from the tabernacle or temple, but was thereby forced to turn it into money, he was to bestow that money on whatsoever pleased him, oxen, sheep, wine, or strong drink; and to eat and drink thereof there before the Lord, both he and his household, ver. 24, 25, 26. As for the tithes of every third year, they were not given only to the Levite, but to the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, ver. 28, 29. and Chap. xxvi. 12, 13. So that ours, if they will have tithes, must admit of these sharers with them. Nay, these tithes were not paid in at all to the Levite, but the Levite himself was to come with those his fellow-guests, and eat his share of them only at his house who provided them; and this not in regard of his ministerial office, but because he had no part nor inheritance in the land. Lastly, the Priests and Levites, a tribe, were of a far different constitution from this of our ministers under the gospel: in them were orders and degrees both by family, dignity, and office, mainly distinguished; the high-priest, his brethren and his sons, to whom the Levites themselves paid tithes, and of the best, were eminently superior, Numb. xviii. 28, 29. No protestant, I suppose, will liken one of our ministers to a High-priest, but rather to a common Levite.

Unless

Unless then, to keep their tithes, they mean to bring back again bishops, archbishops, and the whole gang of prelacy, to whom will they themselves pay tithes, as by that law it was a sin to them if they did not? ver. 32. Certainly this must needs put them to a deep demur, while the desire of holding fast their tithes without sin, may tempt them to bring back again bishops, as the likeness of that hierarchy that should receive tithes from them; and the desire to pay none, may advise them to keep out of the church all orders above them. But if we have to do at present, as I suppose we have, with true reformed protestants, not with papists or prelates, it will not be denied that in the gospel there be but two ministerial degrees, presbyters and deacons: which if they contend to have any succession, reference or conformity with those two degrees under the law, Priests and Levites, it must needs be such whereby our presbyters or ministers may be answerable to priests, and our Deacons to Levites; by which rule of proportion it will follow that we must pay our tithes to the deacons only, and they only to the ministers. But if it be truer yet, that the priesthood of Aaron typified a better reality, 1 Pet. ii. 5. signifying the christian true and "holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifice;" it follows hence, that we are now justly exempt from paying tithes to any who claim from Aaron, since that priesthood is in us now real, which in him was but a shadow. Seeing then by all this which has been shewn, that the law of tithes is partly ceremonial, as the work was for which they were given, partly judicial, not of common, but of particular right to the tribe of Levi, nor to them alone, but to the owner also and his household, at the time of their offering, and every three year to the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, their appointed sharers, and that they were a tribe of priests and deacons improperly compared to the constitution of our ministry; and the tithes given by that people to those deacons only; it follows that our ministers at this day, being neither Priests nor Levites, nor fitly answering to either of them, can have no just title or pretence to tithes, by any consequence drawn from the law of Moses. But they think they have yet a better plea in the example of Melchisedec, who took tithes of Abraham ere the law was given; whence they would infer tithes to be of moral right. But they ought to know, or to remember, that not examples, but express commands oblige our obedience to God or man: next, that whatsoever was done in religion before the law written, is not presently to be counted moral, whenas so many things were then done both ceremonial and judaically judicial, that we need not doubt to conclude all times before Christ, more or less under the ceremonial law. To what end served else those altars and sacrifices, that distinction of clean and unclean entering into the ark, circumcision, and the raising up of seed to the elder brother? Gen. xxxviii. 8. If these things be not moral, though before the law, how are tithes, though in the example of Abraham and Melchisedec? But this instance is so far from being the just ground of a law, that after all circumstances duly weighed both from Gen. xiv. and Heb. vii. it will not be allowed them so much as an example. Melchisedec, besides his priestly benediction, brought with him bread and wine sufficient to refresh Abraham and his whole army; incited to do so, first, by the secret providence of God, intending him for a type of Christ and his priesthood; next, by his due thankfulness and honour to Abraham, who had freed his borders of Salem from a potent enemy: Abraham on the other side honours him with the tenth of all, that is to say (for he took not sure his whole estate with him to that war) of the spoils, Heb. vii. 4. Incited he also by the same secret Providence, to signify as grandfather of Levi, that the levitical priesthood was excelled by the priesthood of Christ. For the giving of a tenth declared, it seems, in those countries and times, him the greater who received it. That which next incited him, was partly his gratitude to requite the present, partly his reverence to the person and his benediction: to his person, as a king and priest, greater therefore than Abraham, who was a priest also, but not a king. And who unhired will be so hardy as to say, that Abraham at any other time ever paid him tithes, either before or after; or had then,

but for this accidental meeting and obligation; or that else Melchisedec had demanded or exacted them, or took them otherwise than as the voluntary gift of Abraham? But our ministers, though neither priests nor kings more than any other christian, greater in their own esteem than Abraham and all his seed, for the verbal labour of a seventh day's preachment, not bringing, like Melchisedec, bread or wine at their own cost, would not take only at the willing hand of liberality or gratitude, but require and exact as due, the tenth, not of spoils, but of our whole estates and labours; nor once, but yearly. We then it seems, by the example of Abraham, must pay tithes to these Melchisedecs: but what if the person of Abraham can neither no way represent us, or will oblige the ministers to pay tithes no less than other men? Abraham had not only a priest in his loins, but was himself a priest, and gave tithes to Melchisedec either as grandfather of Levi, or as father of the faithful. If as grandfather (though he understood it not) of Levi, he obliged not us, but Levi only, the inferior priest, by that homage (as the apostle to the Hebrews clearly enough explains) to acknowledge the greater. And they who by Melchisedec claim from Abraham as Levi's grandfather, have none to seek their tithes of but the Levites, where they can find them. If Abraham, as father of the faithful, paid tithes to Melchisedec, then certainly the ministers also, if they be of that number, paid in him equally with the rest. Which may induce us to believe, that as both Abraham and Melchisedec, so tithes also in that action typical and ceremonial, signified nothing else but that subjection which all the faithful, both ministers and people, owe to Christ, our high-priest and king.

In any literal sense, from this example, they never will be able to extort that the people in those days paid tithes to priests, but this only, that one priest once in his life, of spoils only, and in requital partly of a liberal present, partly of a benediction, gave voluntary tithes, not to a greater priest than himself, as far as Abraham could then understand, but rather to a priest and king joined in one person. They will reply, perhaps, that if one priest paid tithes to another, it must needs be understood that the people did no less to the priest. But I shall easily remove that necessity, by remembering them that in those days was no priest, but the father, or the first-born of each family; and by consequence no people to pay him tithes, but his own children and servants, who had not wherewithal to pay him, but of his own. Yet grant that the people then paid tithes, there will not yet be the like reason to enjoin us; they being then under ceremonies, a meer laity, we now under Christ, a royal priesthood, 1 Pet. ii. 9. as we are coheirs, kings and priests with him, a priest for ever after the order or manner of Melchisedec. As therefore Abraham paid tithes to Melchisedec because Levi was in him, so we ought to pay none because the true Melchisedec is in us, and we in him who can pay to none greater, and hath freed us, by our union with himself, from all compulsive tributes and taxes in his church. Neither doth the collateral place, Heb. vii. make other use of this story, than to prove Christ, personated by Melchisedec, a greater priest than Aaron: Verf. 4. "Now consider how great this man was, &c." and proves not in the least manner that tithes be of any right to ministers, but the contrary: first, the Levites had "a commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though they come out of the loins of Abraham, ver. 5. The commandment then was, it seems, to take tithes of the Jews only, and according to the law. That law changing of necessity with the priesthood, no other sort of ministers, as they must needs be another sort under another priesthood, can receive that tribute of tithes which fell with that law, unless renewed by another express command, and according to another law; no such law is extant. Next, Melchisedec not as a minister, but as Christ himself in person, blessed Abraham who "had the promises," ver. 6. and in him blessed all both ministers and people, both of the law and gospel: That blessing declared him greater and better than whom he blessed, ver. 7. receiving tithes from them all, not as a maintenance, which Melchisedec needed not, but as a sign of homage and subjection to their

their king and priest: whereas ministers bear not the person of Christ in his priesthood or kingship, bless not as he blesses, are not by their blessing greater than Abraham, and all the faithful with themselves included in him; cannot both give and take tithes in Abraham, cannot claim to themselves that sign of our allegiance due only to our eternal king and priest, cannot therefore derive tithes from Melchisedec. Lastly, the eighth verse hath thus; "Here men that die receive tithes: There he received them, of whom it is witnessed that he liveth." Which words intimate, that as he offered himself once for us, so he received once of us in Abraham, and in that place the typical acknowledgment of our redemption: which had it been a perpetual annuity to Christ, by him claimed as his due, Levi must have paid it yearly, as well as then, ver. 9. and our ministers ought still, to some Melchisedec or other, as well now as they did in Abraham. But that Christ never claimed any such tenth as his annual due, much less resigned it to the ministers, his so officious receivers, without express commission or assignment, will be yet clearer as we proceed. Thus much may at length assure us, that this example of Abraham and Melchisedec, though I see of late they build most upon it, can so little be the ground of any law to us, that it will not so much avail them as to the authority of an example. Of like impertinence is that example of Jacob, Gen. xxviii. 22. who of his free choice, not enjoined by any law, vowed the tenth of all that God should give him: which, for aught appears to the contrary, he vowed as a thing no less indifferent before his vow, than the foregoing part thereof: That the stone which he had set there for a pillar, should be God's house. And to whom vowed he this tenth, but to God? Not to any priest, for we read of none to him greater than himself: and to God, no doubt, but he paid what he vowed, both in the building of that Bethel, with other altars elsewhere, and the expence of his continual sacrifices, which none but he had right to offer. However therefore he paid his tenth, it could in no likelihood, unless by such an occasion as beset his grand-father, be to any priest. But, say they, "All the tithe of the land, whether of the seed of the land, or of the fruit of the tree, is the Lord's, holy unto the Lord, Lev. xxvii. 30." And this before it was given to the Levites; therefore since they ceased. No question; For the whole earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof, Psal. xxiv. 1. and the light of nature shews us no less: But that the tenth is his more than the rest, how know I, but as he so declares it? He declares it so here, of the land of Canaan only, as by all circumstance appears, and passes, by deed of gift, this tenth to the Levite; yet so as offered to him first a heave-offering, and consecrated on his altar, Numb. xviii. all which I had as little known, but by that evidence. The Levites are ceased, the gift returns to the giver. How then can we know that he hath given it to any other? Or how can these men presume to take it unoffered first to God, unconsecrated, without another clear and express donation, whereof they shew no evidence or writing? Besides, he hath now alienated that holy land; who can warrantably affirm, that he hath since hallowed the tenth of this land, which none but God hath power to do or can warrant? Their last proof they cite out of the gospel, which makes as little for them, Mat. xxiii. 23. where our Saviour denouncing woe to the Scribes and Pharisees, who paid tithe so exactly, and omitted weightier matters, tells them that these they ought to have done, that is, to have paid tithes. For our Saviour spake then to those who observed the law of Moses, which was yet not fully abrogated, till the destruction of the temple. And by the way here we may observe, out of their own proof, that the Scribes and Pharisees, though then chief teachers of the people, such at least as were not Levites, did not take tithes, but paid them: so much less covetous were the Scribes and Pharisees in those worst times than ours at this day. This is so apparent to the reformed divines of other countries, that when any one of ours hath attempted in Latin to maintain this argument of tithes, though a man would think they might suffer him without opposition, in a point equally tending to the advantage of all ministers, yet they forbear not to oppose him, as in a doctrine not fit to pass unopposed under the gospel. Which shews

shews the modesty, the contentedness of those foreign pastors, with the maintenance given them, their sincerity also in the truth, though less gainful, and the avarice of ours; who through the love of their old papistical tithes, consider not the weak arguments, or rather conjectures and surmises which they bring to defend them. On the other side, although it be sufficient to have proved in general the abolishing of tithes, as part of the judaical or ceremonial law, which is abolished all, as well that before, as that after Moses; yet I shall further prove them abrogated by an express ordinance of the gospel, founded not on any type, or that municipal law of Moses, but on moral and general equity, given us in stead: 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14. "Know ye not, that they who minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple; and they which wait at the altar, are partakers with the altar? So also the Lord hath ordained, that they who preach the gospel, should live of the gospel." He saith not, should live on things which were of the temple, or of the altar, of which were tithes, for that had given them a clear title: but abrogating that former law of Moses, which determined what and how much, by a later ordinance of Christ, which leaves the what and how much indefinite and free, so it be sufficient to live on: he saith, "The Lord hath so ordained, that they who preach the gospel, should live of the gospel;" which hath neither temple, altar, nor sacrifice: Heb. vii. 13. "For he of whom these things are spoken, pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar:" His ministers therefore cannot thence have tithes. And where the Lord hath so ordained, we may find easily in more than one evangelist: Luke x. 7, 8. "In the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: For the labourer is worthy of his hire, &c. And into whatsoever city you enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you." To which ordinance of Christ it may seem likeliest, that the apostle refers us both here, and 1 Tim. v. 18. where he cites this as the saying of our Saviour, "That the labourer is worthy of his hire." And both by this place of Luke, and that of Mat. x. 9, 10, 11. it evidently appears that our Saviour ordained no certain maintenance for his apostles or ministers, publicly or privately, in house or city received; but that, whatever it were, which might suffice to live on: and this not commanded or proportioned by Abraham or by Moses, whom he might easily have here cited, as his manner was, but declared only by a rule of common equity, which proportions the hire as well to the ability of him who gives, as to the labour of him who receives, and recommends him only as worthy, not invests him with a legal right. And mark whereon he grounds this his ordinance; not on a perpetual right of tithes from Melchisedec, as Hirelings pretend, which he never claimed, either for himself, or for his ministers, but on the plain and common equity of rewarding the labourer; worthy sometimes of single, sometimes of double honour, not proportionable by tithes. And the apostle in this forecited chapter to the Corinthians, Ver. 11. affirms it to be no great recompence, if carnal things be reaped for spiritual sown; but to mention tithes, neglects here the fittest occasion that could be offered him, and leaves the rest free and undetermined. Certainly if Christ or his apostles had approved of tithes, they would have, either by writing or tradition, recommended them to the church; and that soon would have appeared in the practice of those primitive and the next ages. But for the first three hundred years and more, in all the ecclesiastical story, I find no such doctrine or example: though error by that time had brought back again priests, altars and oblations; and in many other points of religion had miserably judaized the church. So that the defenders of tithes, after a long pomp, and tedious preparation out of heathen authors, telling us that tithes were paid to Hercules and Apollo, which perhaps was imitated from the Jews, and as it were bespeaking our expectation, that they will abound much more with authorities out of christian story, have nothing of general approbation to begin with from the first three or four ages, but that which abundantly serves to the confutation of their tithes; while they confess that churchmen in those ages lived meerly upon free-will offerings. Neither can they say, that tithes were

were not then paid for want of a civil magistrate to ordain them, for christians had then also lands, and might give out of them what they pleased; and yet of tithes then given we find no mention. And the first christian emperors, who did all things as bishops advised them, supplied what was wanting to the clergy not out of tithes, which were never motioned, but out of their own imperial revenues; as is manifest in Eusebius, Theodoret, and Sozomen, from Constantine to Arcadius. Hence those ancientest reformed churches of the Waldenses, if they rather continued not pure since the apostles, denied that tithes were to be given, or that they were ever given in the primitive church, as appears by an ancient tractate inserted in the Bohemian history. Thus far hath the church been always, whether in her prime or in her ancientest reformation, from the approving of tithes: nor without reason; for they might easily perceive that tithes were fitted to the Jews only, a national church of many incompleat synagogues, uniting the accomplishment of divine worship in one temple; and the Levites there had their tithes paid where they did their bodily work; to which a particular tribe was set apart by divine appointment, not by the people's election: but the Christian church is universal; not tied to nation, diocess, or parish, but consisting of many particular churches compleat in themselves, gathered not by compulsion, or the accident of dwelling nigh together, but by free consent, chusing both their particular church and their church-officers. Whereas if tithes be set up, all these christian privileges will be disturbed and soon lost, and with them christian liberty.

The first authority which our adversaries bring, after those fabulous apostolic canons, which they dare not insist upon, is a provincial council held at Cullen, where they voted tithes to be God's Rent, in the year 356; at the same time perhaps when the three kings reigned there, and of like authority. For to what purpose do they bring these trivial testimonies, by which they might as well prove altars, candles at noon, and the greatest part of those superstitions fetched from Paganism or Jewism, which the papist, inveigled by this fond argument of antiquity, retains to this day? To what purpose those decrees of I know not what bishops, to a parliament and people who have thrown out both bishops and altars, and promised all reformation by the word of God? And that altars brought tithes hither, as one corruption begot another, is evident by one of those questions which the monk Austin propounded to the pope, "concerning those things, which by Offerings of the faithful came to the Altar;" as Beda writes, l. i. c. 27. If then by these testimonies we must have tithes continued, we must again have altars. Of Fathers, by custom so called, they quote Ambrose, Augustin, and some other ceremonial Doctors of the same Leven: whose assertion, without pertinent scripture, no reformed church can admit; and what they vouch is founded on the law of Moses, with which, every where pitifully mistaken, they again incorporate the gospel; as did the rest also of those titular Fathers, perhaps an age or two before them, by many rites and ceremonies, both Jewish and Heathenish, introduced; whereby thinking to gain all, they lost all: and instead of winning Jews and Pagans to be Christians, by too much condescending they turned Christians into Jews and Pagans. To heap such unconvincing citations as these in religion, whereof the scripture only is our rule, argues not much learning nor judgment, but the lost labour of much unprofitable reading. And yet a late hot * Querist for tithes, whom ye may know by his wit's lying ever beside him in the margin, to be ever beside his wits in the text, a fierce reformer once, now rankled with a contrary heat, would send us back, very reformedly indeed, to learn reformation from Tyndarus and Rebuffus, two canonical promoters. They produce next the ancient constitutions of this land, Saxon laws, edicts of kings, and their councils, from Athelstan, in the year 928, that tithes by statute were paid: and might produce from Ina, above 200 years before, that Romescot or Peter's penny, was by as good statute law paid to the pope; from 725, and almost as long continued. And who knows not that this law of tithes

was

* Prynne.

was enacted by those kings and barons upon the opinion they had of their divine right? as the very words import of Edward the Confessor, in the close of that law: "For so blessed Austin preached and taught;" meaning the monk, who first brought the Romish religion into England from Gregory the pope. And by the way I add, that by these laws, imitating the law of Moses, the third part of tithes only was the priest's due; the other two were appointed for the poor, and to adorn or repair churches; as the canons of Ecbert and Elfric witness: Concil. Brit. If then these laws were founded upon the opinion of divine authority, and that authority be found mistaken and erroneous, as hath been fully manifested, it follows, that these laws fall of themselves with their false foundation. But with what face or conscience can they alledge Moses, or these laws for tithes, as they now enjoy or exact them; whereof Moses ordains the owner, as we heard before, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, partakers with the Levite; and these Fathers which they cite, and these though Romish rather than English laws, allotted both to priest and bishop the third part only? But these our protestant, these our new reformed English presbyterian divines, against their own cited authors, and to the shame of their pretended reformation, would engross to themselves all tithes by statute; and supported more by their wilful obstinacy and desire of filthy lucre, than by these both insufficient, and impertinent authorities, would persuade a christian magistracy and parliament, whom we trust God hath restored for a happier reformation, to impose upon us a judaical ceremonial law, and yet from that law to be more irregular and unwarrantable, more complying with a covetous clergy, than any of those Popish kings and parliaments alledged. Another shift they have to plead, that tithes may be moral as well as the sabbath, a tenth of fruits as well as a seventh of Days: I answer, that the prelates who urge this argument have least reason to use it, denying morality in the sabbath, and therein better agreeing with reformed churches abroad than the rest of our divines. As therefore the seventh day is not moral, but a convenient recourse of worship in fit season, whether seventh or other number; so neither is the tenth of our goods, but only a convenient subsistence morally due to ministers. The last and lowest sort of their arguments, that men purchased not their tithe with their land, and such like pettifoggery, I omit; as refuted sufficiently by others: I omit also their violent and irreligious exactions, related no less credibly; their seizing of pots and pans from the poor, who have as good right to tithes as they; from some, the very beds; their suing and imprisoning, worse than when the canon law was in force; worse than when those wicked sons of Eli were priests, whose manner was thus to seize their pretended priestly due by force; 1 Sam. ii. 12. &c. "Whereby men abhorred the offering of the Lord." And it may be feared that many will as much abhor the gospel, if such violence as this be suffered in her ministers, and in that which they also pretend to be the offering of the Lord. For those sons of Belial within some limits made seizure of what they knew was their own by an undoubted law; but these, from whom there is no sanctuary, seize out of mens grounds, out of mens houses, their other goods of double, sometimes of treble value, for that which, did not covetousness and rapine blind them, they know to be not their own by the gospel which they preach. Of some more tolerable than these, thus severely God hath spoken; Isa. xlvii. 10, &c. "They are greedy dogs; they all look to their own way, every one for his gain, from his quarter." With what anger then will he judge them who stand not looking, but under colour of a divine right, fetch by force that which is not their own, taking his name not in vain, but in violence? Nor content, as Gehazi was, to make a cunning, but a constrained advantage of what their master bids them give freely, how can they but return smitten, worse than that sharking minister, with a spiritual leprosy? And yet they cry out sacrilege, that men will not be gulled and baffled the tenth of their estates, by giving credit to frivolous pretences of divine right. Where did God ever clearly declare to all nations, or in all lands, (and none but fools part with their estates, without clearest evidence, on bare supposals and presumptions of them who are the

gainers

gainers thereby) that he required the tenth as due to him or his son perpetually and in all places? Where did he demand it, that we might certainly know, as in all claims of temporal right is just and reasonable? or if demanded, where did he assign it, or by what evident conveyance to ministers? Unless they can demonstrate this by more than conjectures, their title can be no better to tithes than the title of Gehazi was to those things which by abusing his Master's name he rooked from Naaman. Much less where did he command that tithes should be fetched by force, where left not under the Gospel, whatever his right was, to the Freewill-offerings of Men? Which is the greater sacrilege, to bely divine authority, to make the name of Christ accessory to violence, and robbing him of the very honour which he aimed at in bestowing freely the gospel, to commit Simony and Rapine, both secular and ecclesiastical; or on the other side, not to give up the tenth of civil right and propriety to the tricks and impostures of clergymen, contrived with all the art and argument that their bellies can invent or suggest; yet so ridiculous and presuming on the people's dulness and superstition, as to think they prove the divine right of their maintenance by Abraham paying tithes to Melchisedec, whenas Melchisedec in that passage rather gave maintenance to Abraham; in whom all, both priests and ministers as well as laymen, paid tithes, not received them. And because I affirmed above, beginning this first part of my discourse, that God hath given to ministers of the gospel that maintenance only which is justly given them, let us see a little what hath been thought of that other maintenance besides tithes, which of all protestants our English divines either only or most apparently both require and take. Those are fees for christenings, marriages, and burials: which, though whoso will may give freely, yet being not of right, but of free gift, if they be exacted or established, they become unjust to them who are otherwise maintained; and of such evil note, that even the Council of Trent, l. 2. p. 240. makes them liable to the laws against Simony, who take or demand fees for the administering of any sacrament: "*Che la sinodo volendo levare gli abusi introdotti, &c.*" And in the next page, with like severity, condemns the giving or taking for a benefice, and the celebrating of marriages, christenings, and burials, for fees exacted or demanded: nor counts it less Simony to sell the ground or place of burial. And in a State-Assembly at Orleans, 1561, it was decreed, "*Che non si potesse effiger cosa alcuna, &c.* p. 429. That nothing should be exacted for the administering of sacraments, burials, or any other spiritual function." Thus much that council, of all others the most Popish, and this assembly of Papists, though, by their own principles, in bondage to the clergy, were induced, either by their own reason and shame, or by the light of reformation then shining in upon them, or rather by the known canons of many councils and synods long before, to condemn of Simony spiritual fees demanded. For if the minister be maintained for his whole ministry, why should he be twice paid for any part thereof? Why should he, like a servant, seek vails over and above his wages? As for christnings, either they themselves call men to baptism, or men of themselves come: if Ministers invite, how ill had it become John the Baptist to demand fees for his baptizing, or Christ for his christnings? Far less becomes it these now, with a greediness lower than that of tradesmen calling passengers to their shop, and yet paid beforehand, to ask again for doing that which those their founders did freely. If Men of themselves come to be baptized, they are either brought by such as already pay the minister, or come to be one of his disciples and Maintainers: of whom to ask a Fee as it were for entrance, is a piece of poultry craft or caution, befitting none but beggarly artists. Burials and marriages are so little to be any part of their gain, that they who consider well, may find them to be no part of their function. At Burials their attendance they alledge on the corps; all the guests do as much unhired. But their prayers at the grave; superstitiously required: yet if required, their last performance to the deceased of their own flock. But the funeral sermon; at their choice, or if not, an occasion offered them to preach out of season,

which is one part of their office. But something must be spoken in praise; if due, their duty; if undue, their corruption: a peculiar Simony of our divines in England only. But the ground is broken, and especially their unrighteous possession, the chancel. To sell that, will not only raise up in judgment the council of Trent against them, but will lose them the best champion of tithes, their zealous antiquary, Sir Henry Spelman; who in a book written to that purpose, by many cited canons, and some even of times corruptest in the church, proves that fees exacted or demanded for sacraments, marriages, burials, and especially for interring, are wicked, accursed, simoniacal and abominable: Yet thus is the church, for all this noise of reformation, left still unreformed, by the censure of their own synods, their own favourers, a den of thieves and robbers. As for marriages, that ministers should meddle with them, as not sanctified or legitimate, without their celebration, I find no ground in scripture either of precept or example. Likeliest it is (which our Selden hath well observed, 1. 2. c. 28. Ux. Eb.) that in imitation of heathen priests who were wont at nuptials to use many rites and ceremonies, and especially, judging it would be profitable, and the increase of their authority, not to be spectators only in business of such concernment to the life of man, they insinuated that Marriage was not holy without their benediction, and for the better colour, made it a sacrament; being of itself a civil ordinance, a household contract, a thing indifferent and free to the whole race of mankind, not as religious, but as men: best, indeed, undertaken to religious ends, and as the apostle saith, 1 Cor. vii. "in the Lord." Yet not therefore invalid or unholy without a minister and his pretended necessary hallowing, more than any other act, enterprize or contract of civil life, which ought all to be done also in the Lord and to his glory: All which, no less than marriage, were by the cunning of priests heretofore, as material to their profit, transacted at the altar. Our divines deny it to be a sacrament; yet retained the celebration, till prudently a late parliament recovered the civil liberty of marriage from their incroachment, and transferred the ratifying and registering thereof from the canonical shop to the proper cognizance of civil magistrates. Seeing then, that God hath given to ministers under the gospel, that only which is justly given them, that is to say, a due and moderate livelihood, the hire of their labour, and that the heave-offering of tithes is abolished with the altar; yea, though not abolished, yet lawless, as they enjoy them; their Melchisedechian right also trivial and groundless, and both tithes and fees, if exacted or established, unjust and scandalous; we may hope, with them removed, to remove hirelings in some good measure, whom these tempting baits, by law especially to be recovered, allure into the church.

The next thing to be considered in the maintenance of ministers, is by whom it should be given. Wherein though the light of reason might sufficiently inform us, it will be best to consult the scripture: Gal. vi. 6. "Let him that is taught in the word, communicate to him that teacheth, in all good things:" that is to say, in all manner of gratitude, to his ability. 1 Cor. ix. 11. "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we reap your carnal things?" To whom therefore hath not been sown, from him wherefore should be reaped? 1 Tim. v. 17. "Let the elders that rule well, be counted worthy of double honour; especially they who labour in word and doctrine." By these places we see, that recompence was given either by every one in particular who had been instructed, or by them all in common, brought into the church-treasury, and distributed to the ministers according to their several labours: and that was judged either by some extraordinary person, as Timothy, who by the apostle was then left evangelist at Ephesus, 2 Tim. iv. 5. or by some to whom the church deputed that care. This is so agreeable to reason, and so clear, that any one may perceive what iniquity and violence hath prevailed since in the church, whereby it hath been so ordered that they also shall be compelled to recompence the parochial minister, who neither chose him for their teacher, nor have received instruction from him, as being either insufficient, or not resident, or inferior to whom they follow; wherein to bar them their choice,

is to violate christian liberty. Our law-books testify, that before the council of Lateran, in the year 1179, and the fifth of our Henry II. or rather before a decretal Epistle of pope Innocent the III^d, about 1200, and the first of king John, "any Man might have given his tithes to what spiritual Person he would:" and as the Lord Coke notes on that place, Instit. part 2. that "this decretal bound not the Subjects of this realm, but as it seemed just and reasonable." The pope took his reason rightly from the above-cited place, 1 Cor. ix. 11. but falsely supposed every one to be instructed by his parish-priest. Whether this were then first so decreed, or rather long before, as may seem by the laws of Edgar and Canute, that tithes were to be paid, not to whom he would that paid them, but to the cathedral church or the parish priest, it imports not; since the reason which they themselves bring, built on false supposition, becomes alike infirm and absurd, that he should reap from me, who sows not to me; be the cause either his defect, or my free choice. But here it will be readily objected, What if they who are to be instructed be not able to maintain a minister, as in many villages? I answer, that the scripture shews in many places what ought to be done herein. First I offer it to the reason of any man, whether he think the knowledge of Christian religion harder than any other art or science to attain. I suppose he will grant that it is far easier, both of itself, and in regard of God's assisting spirit, not particularly promised us to the attainment of any other knowledge, but of this only: since it was preached as well to the Shepherds of Bethlehem by Angels, as to the eastern wisemen by that star: and our Saviour declares himself anointed to preach the gospel to the poor, Luke iv. 18. then surely to their capacity. They who after him first taught it, were otherwise unlearned men: they who before Hus and Luther first reformed it, were for the meanness of their condition called, "the poor Men of Lions:" and in Flanders at this day, "le Gueus," which is to say, Beggars. Therefore are the scriptures translated into every vulgar tongue, as being held in main matters of Belief and Salvation, plain and easy to the poorest: and such no less than their teachers have the spirit to guide them in all truth, John xiv. 26. and xvi. 13. Hence we may conclude, if men be not all their life-time under a teacher to learn logic, natural philosophy, ethics or mathematics, which are more difficult, that certainly it is not necessary to the attainment of christian knowledge that men should sit all their life long at the feet of a pulpited divine; while he, a lollard indeed over his elbow-cushion, in almost the seventh part of forty or fifty years teaches them scarce half the principles of religion; and his sheep oft-times sit the while to as little purpose of benefitting, as the sheep in their pews at Smithfield; and for the most part by some Simony or other, bought and sold like them: or if this comparison be too low, like those women, 1 Tim. iii. 7. "Ever learning and never attaining;" yet not so much through their own fault, as through the unskilful and immethodical teaching of their pastor, teaching here and there at random out of this or that text, as his ease or fancy, and oft-times as his stealth guides him. Seeing then that christian religion may be so easily attained, and by meanest capacities, it cannot be much difficult to find ways, both how the poor, yea all men may be soon taught what is to be known of Christianity, and they who teach them, recompensed. First, if ministers of their own accord, who pretend that they are called and sent to preach the gospel, those especially who have no particular flock, would imitate our Saviour and his disciples who went preaching through the villages, not only through the cities, Matth. ix. 35. Mark vi. 6. Luke xiii. 22. Acts viii. 25. and there preached to the poor as well as to the rich, looking for no recompence but in Heaven: John iv. 35, 36. "Look on the fields, for they are white already to harvest: and he that reapeth, receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal." This was their wages. But they will soon reply, we ourselves have not wherewithal; who shall bear the charges of our journey? To whom it may as soon be answered, that in likelihood they are not poorer than they who did thus; and if they have not the same faith which those disciples had to trust in God and the promise of Christ

for their maintenance as they did, and yet intrude into the ministry without any livelihood of their own, they cast themselves into miserable hazard or temptation, and oft-times into a more miserable necessity, either to starve, or to please their paymasters rather than God; and give men just cause to suspect, that they came neither called nor sent from above to preach the word, but from below, by the instinct of their own hunger, to feed upon the church. Yet grant it needful to allow them both the charges of their journey and the Hire of their labour, it will belong next to the charity of richer congregations, where most commonly they abound with teachers, to send some of their number to the villages round, as the apostles from Jerusalem sent Peter and John to the city and villages of Samaria, Acts viii. 14, 25. or as the church at Jerusalem sent Barnabas to Antioch, chap. xi. 22. and other churches joining sent Luke to travel with Paul, 2 Cor. viii. 19. though whether they had their charges borne by the church or no, it be not recorded. If it be objected that this itinerary preaching will not serve to plant the gospel in those places, unless they who are sent, abide there some competent time; I answer, that if they stay there a year or two, which was the longest time usually staid by the apostles in one place, it may suffice to teach them, who will attend and learn, all the points of religion necessary to Salvation; then sorting them into several congregations of a moderate number, out of the ablest and zealest among them to create elders, who, exercising and requiring from themselves what they have learned (for no learning is retained without constant exercise and methodical repetition) may teach and govern the rest: and so exhorted to continue faithful and stedfast, they may securely be committed to the providence of God and the guidance of his holy spirit, till God may offer some opportunity to visit them again, and to confirm them: which when they have done, they have done as much as the apostles were wont to do in propagating the gospel, Acts xiv. 23. "And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed." And in the same chapter, ver. 21, 22. "When they had preached the gospel to that city, and had taught many, they returned again to Lystra, and to Iconium and Antioch, confirming the souls of the Disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith." And Chap. xv. 36. "Let us go again, and visit our brethren." And ver. 41. "He went thorough Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches." To these I might add other helps, which we enjoy now, to make more easy the attainment of christian religion by the meanest: the entire scripture translated into English with plenty of notes; and somewhere or other, I trust, may be found some wholesome body of divinity, as they call it, without school-terms and metaphysical notions, which have obscured rather than explained our religion, and made it seem difficult without cause. Thus taught once for all, and thus now and then visited and confirmed, in the most destitute and poorest places of the land, under the government of their own Elders performing all ministerial offices among them, they may be trusted to meet and edify one another whether in church or chapel, or, to save them the trudging of many miles thither, nearer home, though in a house or barn. For notwithstanding the gaudy superstition of some devoted still ignorantly to temples, we may be well assured that he who disdained not to be laid in a manger, disdains not to be preached in a barn; and that by such meetings as these, being indeed most apostolical and primitive, they will in a short time advance more in christian knowledge and reformation of life, than by the many years preaching of such an incumbent, I may say, such an Incubus oft-times, as will be meanly hired to abide long in those places. They have this left perhaps to object further; that to send thus, and to maintain, though but for a year or two, ministers and teachers in several places, would prove chargeable to the churches, though in towns and cities round about. To whom again I answer, that it was not thought so by them who first thus propagated the gospel, though but few in number to us, and much less able to sustain the expence. Yet this expence would be much less than to hire incumbents, or rather incumbrances, for life-time; and a great means

means (which is the subject of this discourse) to diminish hirelings. But be the expence less or more, if it be found burdensome to the churches, they have in this land an easy remedy in their recourse to the civil magistrate; who hath in his hands the disposal of no small revenues, left perhaps anciently to superstitious, but meant undoubtedly to good and best uses; and therefore, once made public, applicable by the present magistrate to such uses as the church, or solid reason from whomsoever, shall convince him to think best. And those uses may be, no doubt, much rather than as glebes and augmentations are now bestowed, to grant such requests as these of the churches; or to erect in greater number all over the land, schools, and competent libraries to those schools, where languages and arts may be taught free together, without the needless, unprofitable and inconvenient removing to another place. So all the land would be soon better civilized, and they who are taught freely at the public cost, might have their education given them on this condition, that therewith content, they should not gad for preferment out of their own country, but continue there thankful for what they received freely, bestowing it as freely on their country, without soaring above the meanness wherein they were born. But how they shall live when they are thus bred and dismissed, will be still the sluggish objection. To which is answered, that those public foundations may be so instituted, as the youth therein may be at once brought up to a competence of learning and to an honest trade; and the hours of teaching so ordered, as their study may be no hindrance to their labour or other calling. This was the breeding of St. Paul, though born of no mean parents, a free citizen of the Roman empire: so little did his trade debase him, that it rather enabled him to use that magnanimity of preaching the gospel through Asia and Europe at his own charges. Thus those preachers among the poor Waldenses, the ancient stock of our reformation, without these helps which I speak of, bred up themselves in trades, and especially in physic and surgery, as well as in the study of scripture, (which is the only true theology) that they might be no burden to the church; and by the example of Christ, might cure both soul and body; through industry joining that to their ministry, which he joined to his by gift of the spirit. Thus relates Peter Gilles in his history of the Waldenses in Piemont. But our ministers think scorn to use a trade, and count it the reproach of this age, that tradesmen preach the gospel. It were to be wished they were all tradesmen; they would not then so many of them, for want of another trade, make a trade of their preaching: and yet they clamour that tradesmen preach; and yet they preach, while they themselves are the worst tradesmen of all. As for church-endowments and possessions, I meet with none considerable before Constantine, but the houses and gardens where they met, and their places of burial: and I persuade me, that from them the ancient Waldenses, whom deservedly I cite so often, held, "That to endow churches is an evil thing; and, that the church then fell off and turned whore, sitting on that beast in the Revelation, when under pope Sylvester she received those temporal donations. So the forecited tractate of their doctrine testifies. This also their own traditions of that heavenly voice witnessed, and some of the ancient fathers then living foresaw and deplored. And indeed, how could these endowments thrive better with the church, being unjustly taken by those emperors, without suffrage of the people, out of the tributes and public lands of each city, whereby the people became liable to be oppressed with other taxes. Being therefore given for the most part by kings and other public persons, and so likeliest out of the public, and if without the people's consent, unjustly, however to public ends of much concernment, to the good or evil of a commonwealth, and in that regard made public though given by private persons, or which is worse, given, as the clergy then persuaded men, for their souls health, a pious gift; but as the truth was, oft-times a bribe to God, or to Christ for absolution, as they were then taught, from murders, adulteries, and other heinous crimes; what shall be found heretofore given by kings or princes out of the public, may justly by the magistrate be recalled and re-appropriated to the civil revenue: what by private

or

or public persons out of their own, the price of blood or lust, or to some such purgatorial and superstitious uses, not only may, but ought to be taken off from Christ, as a foul dishonour laid upon him, or not impiously given, nor in particular to any one, but in general to the church's good, may be converted to that use which shall be judged tending more directly to that general end. Thus did the princes and cities of Germany in the first reformation; and defended their so doing by many reasons, which are set down at large in Sleidan, Lib. 6. Anno 1526, and Lib. 11. Anno 1537, and Lib. 13. Anno 1540. But that the magistrate either out of that church-revenue which remains yet in his hand, or establishing any other maintenance instead of tithe, should take into his own power the stipendiary maintenance of church-ministers, or compel it by law, can stand neither with the people's right, nor with christian liberty, but would suspend the church wholly upon the state, and turn her ministers into state-pensioners. And for the magistrate in person of a nursing father to make the church his meer ward, as always in minority, the church, to whom he ought as a magistrate, Isa. xlix. 23. "to bow down with his face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of her feet;" her to subject to his political drifts or conceived opinions, by mastering her revenue; and so by his examinant committees to circumscribe her free election of ministers, is neither just nor pious; no honour done to the church, but a plain dishonour: and upon her whose only head is in heaven, yea upon him, who is her only head, sets another in effect, and which is most monstrous, a human on a heavenly, a carnal on a spiritual, a political head on an ecclesiastical body; which at length by such heterogeneal, such incestuous conjunction, transforms her oft-times into a beast of many heads and many horns. For if the church be of all societies the holiest on earth, and so to be revered by the magistrate; not to trust her with her own belief and integrity, and therefore not with the keeping, at least with the disposing of what revenue shall be found justly and lawfully her own, is to count the church not a holy congregation, but a pack of giddy or dishonest persons, to be ruled by civil power in sacred affairs. But to proceed further in the truth yet more freely, seeing the christian church is not national, but consisting of many particular congregations, subject to many changes, as well through civil accidents, as through schism and various opinions, not to be decided by any outward judge, being matters of conscience, whereby these pretended church-revenues, as they have been ever, so are like to continue endless matter of dissention both between the church and magistrate, and the churches among themselves, there will be found no better remedy to these evils, otherwise incurable, than by the incorruptest council of those Waldenses, or first reformers, to remove them as a pest, an apple of discord in the church, (for what else can be the effect of riches, and the snare of money in religion?) and to convert them to those more profitable uses above expressed, or other such as shall be judged most necessary; considering that the church of Christ was founded in poverty rather than in revenues, stood purest and prospered best without them, received them unlawfully from them who both erroneously and unjustly, sometimes impiously, gave them, and so justly was ensnared and corrupted by them. And lest it be thought that these revenues withdrawn and better employed, the magistrate ought instead to settle by statute some maintenance of ministers, let this be considered first, that it concerns every man's conscience to what religion he contributes; and that the civil magistrate is intrusted with civil rights only, not with conscience, which can have no deputy or representer of itself, but one of the same mind: next, that what each man gives to the minister, he gives either as to God, or as to his teacher; if as to God, no civil power can justly consecrate to religious uses any part either of civil revenue, which is the people's, and must save them from other taxes, or of any man's propriety, but God by special command, as he did by Moses, or the owner himself by voluntary intention and the persuasion of his giving it to God. Forced consecrations out of another man's estate are no better than forced vows, hateful to God, "who loves a chearful giver; but much more hateful, wrung out of mens purses to maintain

maintain a disapproved ministry against their conscience ; however unholy, infamous, and dishonourable to his ministers and the free gospel, maintained in such unworthy manner as by violence and extortion. If he give it as to his teacher, what justice or equity compels him to pay for learning that religion which leaves freely to his choice, whether he will learn it or no, whether of this teacher or another, and especially to pay for what he never learned, or approves not ; whereby, besides the wound of his conscience, he becomes the less able to recompence his true teacher ? Thus far hath been enquired by whom church-ministers ought to be maintained, and hath been proved most natural, most equal and agreeable with scripture, to be by them who receive their teaching ; and by whom, if they be unable. Which ways well observed, can discourage none but hirelings, and will much lessen their number in the church.

It remains lastly to consider, in what manner God hath ordained that recompence be given to ministers of the gospel ; and by all scripture it will appear that he hath given it them not by civil law and freehold, as they claim, but by the benevolence and free gratitude of such as receive them : Luke x. 7, 8. " Eating and drinking such things as they give you. If they receive you, eat such things as are set before you. Matth. x. 7, 8. As ye go, preach, saying, the kingdom of God is at hand, &c. Freely ye have received, freely give. If God have ordained ministers to preach freely, whether they receive recompence or not, then certainly he hath forbid both them to compel it, and others to compel it for them. But freely given, he accounts it as given to himself : Phil. iv. 16, 17, 18. " Ye sent once and again to my necessity : Not because I desire a gift ; but I desire fruit that may abound to your account. Having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odour of sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God : " which cannot be from force or unwillingness. The same is said of alms, Heb. xiii. 16. " To do good and to communicate, forget not ; for with such sacrifice God is well pleased. " Whence the primitive church thought it no shame to receive all their maintenance as the alms of their auditors. Which they who defend tithes, as if it made for their cause, whenas it utterly confutes them, omit not to set down at large ; proving to our hands out of Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, and others, that the clergy lived at first upon the meer benevolence of their hearers ; who gave what they gave, not to the clergy, but to the church ; out of which the clergy had their portions given them in baskets, and were thence called Sportularii, Basket-clerks : that their portion was a very mean allowance, only for a bare livelihood ; according to those precepts of our Saviour, Matth. x. 7, &c. the rest was distributed to the poor. They cite also out of Prosper, the disciple of St. Austin, that such of the clergy as had means of their own, might not without sin partake of church maintenance ; not receiving thereby food which they abound with, but feeding on the sins of other men : that the Holy Ghost saith of such clergymen, they eat the sins of my people ; and that a council at Antioch, in the year 340, suffered not either priest or bishop to live on church-maintenance without necessity. Thus far tithers themselves have contributed to their own confutation, by confessing that the church lived primitively on alms. And I add, that about the year 359, Constantius the emperor having summon'd a general council of bishops to Ariminum in Italy, and provided for their subsistence there, the British and French bishops judging it not decent to live on the public, chose rather to be at their own charges. Three only out of Britain constrained through want, yet refusing offered assistance from the rest, accepted the emperor's provision ; judging it more convenient to subsist by public than by private sustenance. Whence we may conclude, that Bishops then in this island had their livelihood only from benevolence ; in which regard this relater Sulpitius Severus, a good author of the same time, highly praises them. And the Waldenses, our first reformers, both from the scripture and these primitive examples, maintained those among them who bore the office of ministers, by alms only. Take their very words from the history written of them in French, Part. 3. Lib. 2. Chap. 2. " La nourriture & ce de quoy

quoy nous sommes couverts, &c. Our Food and cloathing is sufficiently administered and given to us by way of gratuity and alms, by the good people whom we teach." If then by alms and benevolence, not by legal force, not by tenure of freehold or copyhold: for alms, though just, cannot be compelled; and benevolence forced is malevolence rather, violent and inconsistent with the gospel; and declares him no true minister thereof, but a rapacious hireling rather, who by force receiving it, eats the bread of violence and exaction, no holy or just livelihood, no not civilly counted honest; much less befitting such a spiritual ministry. But, say they, our maintenance is our due, tithes the right of Christ, unseparable from the priest, no where repealed; if then, not otherwise to be had, by law to be recovered: for though Paul were pleased to forego his due, and not to use his power, 1 Cor. ix. 12. yet he had a power, ver. 4. and bound not others. I answer first, because I see them still so loth to unlearn their decimal arithmetic, and still grasp their tithes as inseparable from a priest, that ministers of the gospel are not priests; and therefore separated from tithes by their own exclusion, being neither called priests in the New Testament, nor of any order known in scripture: not of Melchisedec, proper to Christ only; not of Aaron, as they themselves will confess; and the third priesthood only remaining, is common to all the faithful. But they are ministers of our high-priest. True, but not of his priesthood, as the Levites were to Aaron; for he performs that whole office himself incommunicably. Yet tithes remain, say they, still unreleased, the due of Christ; and to whom payable, but to his ministers? I say again, that no man can so understand them, unless Christ in some place or other so claim them. That example of Abraham argues nothing but his voluntary act; honour once only done, but on what consideration, whether to a priest or to a king, whether due the honour, arbitrary that kind of honour or not, will after all contending be left still in meer conjecture: which must not be permitted in the claim of such a needy and suttie spiritual corporation, pretending by divine right to the tenth of all other mens estates; nor can it be allowed by wise men or the verdict of common law. And the tenth part, though once declared holy, is declared now to be no holier than the other nine, by that command to Peter, Acts x. 15, 28. whereby all distinction of holy and unholy is removed from all things. Tithes therefore, though claimed, and holy under the law, yet are now released and quitted both by that command to Peter, and by this to all ministers, above-cited Luke x. "eating and drinking such things as they give you:" made holy now by their free gift only. And therefore St. Paul, 1 Cor. ix. 4. asserts his power indeed; but of what? not of tithes, but, "to eat and drink such things as are given" in reference to this command; which he calls not holy things, or things of the gospel, as if the gospel had any consecrated things in answer to things of the temple, ver. 13. but he calls them "your carnal things," ver. 11. without changing their property. And what power had he? Not the Power of force, but of conscience only, whereby he might lawfully and without scruple live on the gospel; receiving what was given him, as the recompence of his labour. For if Christ the master hath professed his kingdom to be not of this world, it suits not with that profession, either in him or his ministers, to claim temporal right from spiritual respects. He who refused to be the divider of an inheritance between two brethren, cannot approve his ministers, by pretended right from him, to be dividers of tenths and freeholds out of other mens possessions, making thereby the gospel but a cloak of carnal interest, and to the contradiction of their master, turning his heavenly kingdom into a kingdom of this world, a kingdom of force and rapine: To whom it will be one day thundered more terribly than to Gehazi, for thus dishonouring a far greater master and his gospel; "is this a time to receive money, and to receive garments, and olive-yards, and vineyards, and sheep and oxen?" The leprosy of Naaman linked with that apostolic curse of perishing imprecated on Simon Magus, may be feared will "cleave to such and to their seed for ever." So that when all is done, and belly hath used in vain all her cunning shifts, I doubt not but all true ministers, considering

considering the demonstration of what hath been here proved, will be wise, and think it much more tolerable to hear that no maintenance of ministers, whether tithes or any other, can be settled by statute, but must be given by them who receive instruction; and freely given, as God hath ordained. And indeed what can be a more honourable maintenance to them than such, whether alms or willing oblations, as these; which being accounted both alike as given to God, the only acceptable sacrifices now remaining, must needs represent him who receives them much in the care of God, and nearly related to him, when not by worldly force and constraint, but with religious awe and reverence, what is given to God, is given to him; and what to him, accounted as given to God. This would be well enough, say they; but how many will so give? I answer, as many, doubtless, as shall be well taught, as many as God shall so move. Why are ye so distrustful, both of your own doctrine and of God's promises, fulfilled in the experience of those disciples first sent: Luke xxii. 35. "When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye any thing? And they said, Nothing." How then came ours, or who sent them thus destitute, thus poor and empty both of purse and faith? Who stile themselves embassadors of Jesus Christ, and seem to be his tithe-gatherers, though an office of their own setting up to his dishonour, his exacters, his Publicans rather, not trusting that he will maintain them in their embassy, unless they bind him to his promise by a statute-law, that we shall maintain them. Lay down for shame that magnificent title, while ye seek maintenance from the people: It is not the manner of embassadors to ask maintenance of them to whom they are sent. But he who is Lord of all things, hath so ordained: trust him then; he doubtless will command the people to make good his promises of maintenance more honourably unasked, unraked for. This they know, this they preach, yet believe not: but think it as impossible, without a statute-law, to live of the gospel, as if by those words they were bid go eat their bibles, as Ezekiel and John did their books; and such doctrines as these are as bitter to their bellies; but will serve so much the better to discover hirelings, who can have nothing, though but in appearance, just and solid to answer for themselves against what hath been here spoken, unless perhaps this one remaining pretence, which we shall quickly see to be either false or uningenuous.

They pretend that their education, either at school or university, hath been very chargeable, and therefore ought to be repaired in future by a plentiful maintenance: Whenas it is well known, that the better half of them, (and oft-times poor and pitiful boys, of no merit or promising hopes that might intitle them to the public provision, but their poverty and the unjust favour of friends,) have had the most of their breeding, both at school and university, by scholarships, exhibitions and fellowships at the public cost, which might engage them the rather to give freely, as they have freely received. Or if they have missed of these helps at the latter place, they have after two or three years left the course of their studies there, if they ever well began them, and undertaken, though furnished with little else but ignorance, boldness and ambition, if with no worse vices, a chaplainship in some gentleman's house, to the frequent imbasing of his sons with illiterate and narrow principles. Or if they have lived there upon their own, who knows not that seven years charge of living there, to them who fly not from the government of their parents to the licence of a university, but come seriously to study, is no more than may be well defrayed and reimbursed by one year's revenue of an ordinary good benefice? If they had then means of breeding from their parents, it is likely they have more now; and if they have, it needs must be mechanic and uningenuous in them, to bring a bill of charges for the learning of those liberal arts and sciences, which they have learned (if they have indeed learned them, as they seldom have) to their own benefit and accomplishment. But they will say, we had betaken us to some other trade or profession, had we not expected to find a better livelihood by the ministry. This is that which I looked for, to discover them openly neither true lovers of learning, and so very seldom

guilty of it, nor true ministers of the gospel. So long ago out of date is that old true saying, 1 Tim. iii. 1. "If a man desire a bishopric, he desires a good work:" for now commonly he who desires to be a minister, looks not at the work, but at the wages; and by that lure or loubell, may be tolled from parish to parish all the town over. But what can be plainer Simony, than thus to be at charges beforehand, to no other end than to make their ministry doubly or trebly beneficial? To whom it might be said, as justly as to that Simon, "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money; thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter. Next, it is a fond error, though too much believed among us, to think that the university makes a minister of the gospel; what it may conduce to other arts and sciences, I dispute not now: but that which makes fit a minister, the scripture can best inform us to be only from above, whence also we are bid to seek them; Mat. ix. 38. "Pray ye therefore to the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest. Acts xx. 28. The flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers. Rom. x. 15. How shall they preach, unless they be sent?" By whom sent? by the university, or the magistrate, or their belly? No surely, but sent from God only, and that God who is not their belly. And whether he be sent from God, or from Simon Magus, the inward sense of his calling and spiritual ability will sufficiently tell him; and that strong obligation felt within him, which was felt by the apostle, will often express from him the same words: 1 Cor. ix. 16. "Necessity is laid upon me, yea, Woe is me if I preach not the gospel." Not a beggarly necessity, and the Woe feared otherwise of perpetual want, but such a necessity as made him willing to preach the gospel Gratis, and to embrace poverty, rather than as a woe to fear it. 1 Cor. xii. 28. "God hath set some in the church, first apostles, &c. Ephes. iv. 11. &c. He gave some apostles, &c. For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come to the unity of the faith." Whereby we may know, that as he made them at the first, so he makes them still, and to the world's end. 2 Cor. iii. 6. "Who hath also made us fit or able ministers of the New Testament. 1 Tim. iv. 14. The gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, and the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." These are all the means which we read of, required in scripture to the making of a minister. All this is granted, you will say; but yet that it is also requisite he should be trained in other learning; which can be nowhere better had than at universities. I answer, that what learning, either human or divine, can be necessary to a minister, may as easily and less chargeably be had in any private house. How deficient else, and to how little purpose are all those piles of sermons, notes, and comments on all parts of the bible, bodies and marrows of divinity, besides all other sciences, in our English tongue; many of the same books which in Latin they read at the university? And the small necessity of going thither to learn divinity, I prove first from the most part of themselves, who seldom continue there till they have well got through logic, their first rudiments; though, to say truth, logic also may much better be wanting in disputes of divinity, than in the subtle debates of lawyers, and statesmen, who yet seldom or never deal with Syllogisms. And those theological disputations there held by professors and graduates, are such as tend least of all to the edification or capacity of the people, but rather perplex and leven pure doctrine with scholastical trash, than enable any minister to the better preaching of the gospel. Whence we may also compute, since they come to reckonings, the charges of his needful library: which, though some shame not to value at 600 l. may be competently furnished for 60 l. If any man for his own curiosity or delight be in books further expensive, that is not to be reckoned as necessary to his ministerial, either breeding or function. But papists and other adversaries, cannot be confuted without fathers and councils, immense volumes, and of vast charges. I will shew them therefore a shorter and a better way of confutation: Tit. i. 9. "Holding fast the faithful word, as he hath been taught, that he may be able

able by sound doctrine, both to exhort and to convince gainsayers :” who are confuted as soon as heard, bringing that which is either not in scripture, or against it. To pursue them further through the obscure and intangled wood of antiquity, fathers and councils fighting one against another, is needless, endless, not requisite in a minister, and refused by the first reformers of our religion. And yet we may be confident, if these things be thought needful, let the state but erect in public good store of libraries, and there will not want men in the church, who of their own inclinations will become able in this kind against papist or any other adversary. I have thus at large examined the usual pretences of hirelings, coloured over most commonly with the cause of learning and universities; as if with divines learning stood and fell, wherein for the most part their pittance is so small: and, to speak freely, it were much better there were not one divine in the universities, no school-divinity known, the idle sophistry of monks, the canker of religion; and that they who intended to be ministers, were trained up in the church only by the scripture, and in the original languages thereof at school; without fetching the compass of other arts and sciences, more than what they can well learn at secondary leisure, and at home. Neither speak I this in contempt of learning, or the ministry, but hating the common cheats of both; hating that they who have preached out bishops, prelates, and canonists, should, in what serves their own ends, retain their false opinions, their Pharisaical leaven, their avarice, and closely their ambition, their pluralities, their non-residencies, their odious fees, and use their legal and popish arguments for tithes: that independents should take that name, as they may justly from the true freedom of christian doctrine and church-discipline subject to no superior judge but God only, and seek to be dependents on the magistrate for their maintenance; which two things, independance and state-hire in religion, can never consist long or certainly together. For magistrates at one time or other, not like these at present our patrons of christian liberty, will pay none but such whom by their committees of examination, they find conformable to their interest and opinions: And hirelings will soon frame themselves to that interest, and those opinions which they see best pleasing to their paymasters; and to seem right themselves, will force others as to the truth. But most of all they are to be reviled and shamed, who cry out with the distinct voice of notorious hirelings; that if ye settle not our maintenance by law, farewell the gospel; than which nothing can be uttered more false, more ignominious, and I may say, more blasphemous against our Saviour; who hath promised without this condition, both his holy spirit, and his own presence with his church to the world’s end: Nothing more false (unless with their own mouths they condemn themselves for the unworthiest and most mercenary of all other ministers) by the experience of 300 years after Christ, and the churches at this day in France, Austria, Polonia, and other places, witnessing the contrary under an adverse magistrate, not a favourable; nothing more ignominious, levelling, or rather undervaluing Christ beneath Mahomet. For if it must be thus, how can any christian object it to a Turk, that his religion stands by force only; and not justly fear from him this reply, yours both by force and money, in the judgment of your own preachers? This is that which makes Atheists in the land, whom they so much complain of: not the want of maintenance, or preachers, as they alledge, but the many hirelings and cheaters that have the gospel in their hands; hands that still crave, and are never satisfied. Likely ministers indeed, to proclaim the faith, or to exhort our trust in God, when they themselves will not trust him to provide for them in the message whereon, they say, he sent them; but threaten, for want of temporal means, to desert it; calling that want of means, which is nothing else but the want of their own faith; and would force us to pay the hire of building our faith to their covetous incredulity. Doubtless, if God only be he who gives ministers to his church till the world’s end; and through the whole gospel never sent us for ministers to the schools of philosophy, but rather bids us beware of such “vain deceit,” Col. ii. 8. (which the primitive church, after two or

three ages not remembring, brought herself quickly to confusion) if all the faithful be now "a holy and a royal priesthood," 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9. not excluded from the dispensation of things holiest, after free election of the church, and imposition of hands, there will not want ministers elected out of all sorts and orders of men, for the gospel makes no difference from the magistrate himself to the meanest artificer, if God evidently favour him with spiritual gifts, as he can easily, and oft hath done, while those batchelor divines and doctors of the tippet have been passed by. Heretofore in the first evangelic times, (and it were happy for Christendom if it were so again) ministers of the gospel were by nothing else distinguished from other christians, but by their spiritual knowledge and sanctity of life, for which the church elected them to be her teachers and overseers, though not thereby to separate them from whatever calling she then found them following besides; as the example of St. Paul declares, and the first times of christianity. When once they affected to be called a clergy, and became as it were, a peculiar tribe of Levites, a party, a distinct order in the commonwealth, bred up for divines in babbling schools, and fed at the publick cost, good for nothing else but what was good for nothing, they soon grew idle: that idleness, with fulness of bread, begat pride and perpetual contention with their feeders the despised laity, through all ages ever since; to the perverting of religion, and the disturbance of all Christendom. And we may confidently conclude, it never will be otherwise while they are thus upheld undepending on the church, on which alone they anciently depended, and are by the magistrate publickly maintained a numerous faction of indigent persons, crept for the most part out of extreme want and bad nurture, claiming by divine right and freehold the tenth of our estates, to monopolize the ministry as their peculiar, which is free and open to all able christians, elected by any church. Under this pretence exempt from all other employment, and enriching themselves on the public, they last of all prove common incendiaries, and exalt their horns against the magistrate himself that maintains them, as the priest of Rome did soon after against his benefactor the emperor, and the presbyters of late in Scotland. Of which hireling crew, together with all the mischiefs, dissensions, troubles, wars meerly of their kindling, Christendom might soon rid herself and be happy, if christians would but know their own dignity, their liberty, their adoption, and let it not be wondered if I say, their spiritual priesthood, whereby they have all equally access to any ministerial function, whenever called by their own abilities, and the church, though they never came near commencement or university. But while protestants, to avoid the due labour of understanding their own religion, are content to lodge it in the breast, or rather in the books of a clergyman, and to take it thence by scraps and mammocks, as he dispenses it in his Sunday's dole; they will be always learning and never knowing; always infants; always either his vassals, as lay-papists are to their priests; or at odds with him, as reformed principles give them some light to be not wholly conformable; whence infinite disturbances in the state, as they do, must needs follow. Thus much I had to say; and, I suppose, what may be enough to them who are not avariciously bent otherwise, touching the likeliest means to remove hirelings out of the church; than which nothing can more conduce to truth, to peace and all happiness both in church and state. If I be not heard nor believed, the event will bear me witness to have spoken truth; and I, in the mean while, have borne my witness, not out of season, to the church and to my country.

A LETTER

A
L E T T E R
T O A
F R I E N D,
C O N C E R N I N G

The RUPTURES of the COMMONWEALTH.

Published from the Manuscript.

S I R,

U P O N the sad and serious discourse which we fell into last night, concerning these dangerous ruptures of the Commonwealth, scarce yet in her infancy, which cannot be without some inward flaw in her bowels; I began to consider more intently thereon than hitherto I have been wont, resigning myself to the wisdom and care of those who had the government; and not finding that either God, or the public required more of me, than my prayers for them that govern. And since you have not only stirred up my thoughts, by acquainting me with the state of affairs, more inwardly than I knew before; but also have desired me to set down my opinion thereof, trusting to your ingenuity, I shall give you freely my apprehension, both of our present evils, and what expedients, if God in mercy regard us, may remove them. I will begin with telling you how I was over-joyed, when I heard that the army, under the working of God's holy spirit, as I thought, and still hope well, had been so far wrought to christian humility, and self-denial, as to confess in public their back-sliding from the good old cause, and to shew the fruits of their repentance, in the righteousness of their restoring the old famous parliament, which they had without just authority dissolved: I call it the famous parliament, though not the harmless, since none well-affected, but will confess, they have deserved much more of these nations, than they have undeserved. And I persuade me, that God was pleased with their restitution, signing it, as he did, with such a signal victory, when so great a part of the nation were desperately conspired to call back again their Ægyptian bondage. So much the more it now amazes me, that they, whose lips were yet scarce closed from giving thanks for that great deliverance, should be now relapsing, and so soon again backsliding into the same fault, which they confessed so lately, and so solemnly to God and the world, and more lately punished in those Cheshire rebels; that they should now dissolve that parliament, which they themselves re-established, and acknowledged for their supreme power in their other day's humble representation: and
all

all this, for no apparent cause of public concernment to the church or commonwealth, but only for discommissing nine great officers in the army; which had not been done, as is reported, but upon notice of their intentions against the parliament. I presume not to give my censure on this action, not knowing, as yet I do not, the bottom of it. I speak only what it appears to us without doors, till better cause be declared, and I am sure to all other nations most illegal and scandalous, I fear me barbarous, or rather scarce to be exampled among any barbarians, that a paid army should, for no other cause, thus subdue the supreme power that set them up. This, I say, other nations will judge to the sad dishonour of that army, lately so renowned for the civilest and best ordered in the world, and by us here at home, for the most conscientious. Certainly, if the great officers and soldiers of the Holland, French, or Venetian forces, should thus sit in council, and write from garison to garison against their superiors, they might as easily reduce the king of France, or Duke of Venice, and put the United Provinces in like disorder and confusion. Why do they not, being most of them held ignorant of true religion? because the light of nature, the laws of human society, the reverence of their magistrates, covenants, engagements, loyalty, allegiance, keeps them in awe. How grievous will it then be? how infamous to the true religion which we profess? how dishonourable to the name of God, that his fear and the power of his knowledge in an army professing to be his, should not work that obedience, that fidelity to their supreme magistrates, that levied them and paid them; when the light of nature, the laws of human society, covenants, and contracts, yea common shame works in other armies, amongst the worst of them? Which will undoubtedly pull down the heavy judgment of God among us, who cannot but avenge these hypocrisies, violations of truth and holiness; if they be indeed so as they yet seem. For neither do I speak this in reproach to the army, but as jealous of their honour, inciting them to manifest and publish with all speed, some better cause of these their late actions, than hath hitherto appeared, and to find out the Achan amongst them, whose close ambition in all likelihood abuses their honest natures against their meaning to these disorders; their readiest way to bring in again the common enemy, and with him the destruction of true religion, and civil liberty. But, because our evils are now grown more dangerous and extreme, than to be remedied by complaints, it concerns us now to find out what remedies may be likeliest to save us from approaching ruin. Being now in anarchy, without a counselling and governing power; and the army, I suppose, finding themselves insufficient to discharge at once both military and civil affairs, the first thing to be found out with all speed, without which no Commonwealth can subsist, must be a senate, or general council of state, in whom must be the power, first, to preserve the public peace; next, the commerce with foreign nations; and lastly, to raise moneys for the management of these affairs: this must either be the parliament re-admitted to sit, or a council of state allowed of by the army, since they only now have the power. The terms to be stood on are, liberty of conscience to all professing scripture to be the rule of their faith and worship; and the abjuration of a single person. If the parliament be again thought on, to salve honour on both sides, the well-affected party of the city, and the congregated churches, may be induced to mediate by public addresses, and brotherly beseechings; which, if there be that faintship among us which is talked of, ought to be of highest and undeniable persuasion to reconciliation. If the parliament be thought well dissolved, as not complying fully to grant liberty of conscience, and the necessary consequence thereof, the removal of a forced maintenance from ministers, then must the army forthwith chuse a council of state, whereof as many to be of the parliament, as are undoubtedly affected to these two conditions proposed. That which I conceive only able to cement, and unite for ever the army, either to the parliament recalled, or this chosen council, must be a mutual league and oath, private or public, not to desert one another till death: That is to say, that the army be kept up, and all these officers in their places during

during life, and so likewise the parliament, or counsellors of state; which will be no way unjust, considering their known merits on either side, in council or in field, unless any be found false to any of these two principles, or otherwise personally criminous in the judgment of both parties. If such a union as this be not excepted on the army's part, be confident there is a single person underneath. That the army be upheld, the necessity of our affairs and factions will constrain long enough perhaps, to content the longest liver in the army. And whether the civil government be an annual democracy, or a perpetual aristocracy, is not to me a consideration for the extremities wherein we are, and the hazard of our safety from our common enemy, gaping at present to devour us. That it be not an oligarchy, or the faction of a few, may be easily prevented by the numbers of their own chusing, who may be found infallibly constant to those two conditions forenamed, full liberty of conscience, and the abjuration of monarchy proposed: and the well-ordered committees of their faithfullest adherents in every county, may give this government the resemblance and effects of a perfect democracy. As for the reformation of laws, and the places of judicature, whether to be here, as at present, or in every county, as hath been long aimed at, and many such proposals, tending no doubt to public good, they may be considered in due time, when we are past these pernicious pangs, in a hopeful way of health, and firm constitution. But unless these things, which I have above proposed, one way or other, be once settled, in my fear, which God avert, we instantly ruin; or at best become the servants of one or other single person, the secret author and fomentor of these disturbances. You have the sum of my present thoughts, as much as I understand of these affairs freely imparted; at your request, and the persuasion you wrought in me, that I might chance hereby to be some way serviceable to the Commonwealth, in a time when all ought to be endeavouring what good they can, whether much or but little. With this you may do what you please, put out, put in, communicate or suppress: you offend not me, who only have obeyed your opinion, that in doing what I have done, I might happen to offer something which might be of some use in this great time of need. However, I have not been wanting to the opportunity which you presented before me, of shewing the readiness which I have in the midst of my unfitness, to whatever may be required of me, as a public duty.

October 20. 1659.

THE
PRESENT MEANS,
AND
BRIEF DELINEATION
OF A
FREE COMMONWEALTH,
Easy to be put in PRACTICE, and without DELAY.

In a LETTER to GENERAL MONK.

Published from the Manuscript.

FIRST, all endeavours speedily to be used, that the ensuing election be of such as are already firm, or inclinable to constitute a free Commonwealth (according to the former qualifications decreed in parliament, and not yet repealed, as I hear) without single person, or house of Lords. If these be not such, but the contrary, who foresees not, that our liberties will be utterly lost in this next parliament, without some powerful course taken, of speediest prevention? The speediest way will be to call up forthwith the chief gentlemen out of every county; to lay before them (as your excellency hath already, both in your published letters to the army, and your declaration recited to the members of parliament) the danger and confusion of re-admitting kingship in this land; especially against the rules of all prudence and example, in a family once ejected, and thereby not to be trusted with the power of revenge: that you will not longer delay them with vain expectation, but will put into their hands forthwith the possession of a free Commonwealth; if they will first return immediately and elect them, by such at least of the people as are rightly qualified, a standing council in every city, and great town, which may then be dignified with the name of city, continually to consult the good and flourishing state of that place, with a competent territory adjoined; to assume the judicial laws, either those that are, or such as they themselves shall new make severally, in each commonalty, and all judicatures, all magistracies, to the administration of all justice between man and man, and all the ornaments of public civility, academies, and such like, in their own hands. Matters appertaining to men of several counties, or territories, may be determined, as they are here at London, or in some more convenient place, under equal judges.

Next, That in every such capital place, they will chuse them the usual number of ablest knights and burgeses, engaged for a Commonwealth, to make up the parliament, or (as it will from henceforth be better called) the Grand or General Council of the nation:

Nation : whose office must be, with due caution, to dispose of forces, both by sea and land, under the conduct of your excellency, for the preservation of peace, both at home and abroad ; must raise and manage the public revenue, but with provident inspection of their accompts ; must administer all foreign affairs, make all general laws, peace or war, but not without assent of the standing council in each city, or such other general assembly as may be called on such occasion, from the whole territory, where they may, without much trouble, deliberate on all things fully, and send up their suffrages within a set time, by deputies appointed. Though this grand council be perpetual (as in that book I proved would be best and most conformable to best examples) yet they will then, thus limited, have so little matter in their hands, or power to endanger our liberty ; and the people so much in theirs, to prevent them, having all judicial laws in their own choice, and free votes in all those which concern generally the whole commonwealth, that we shall have little cause to fear the perpetuity of our general senate ; which will be then nothing else but a firm foundation and custody of our public liberty, peace, and union, through the whole commonwealth, and the transactors of our affairs with foreign nations.

If this yet be not thought enough, the known expedient may at length be used, of a partial rotation.

Lastly, if these gentlemen convoked, refuse these fair and noble offers of immediate liberty, and happy condition, no doubt there be enough in every county who will thankfully accept them ; your excellency once more declaring publickly this to be your mind, and having a faithful veteran army, so ready, and glad to assist you in the prosecution thereof. For the full and absolute administration of law in every county, which is the difficultest of these proposals, hath been of most long desired ; and the not granting it, held a general grievance. The rest when they shall see the beginnings and proceedings of these constitutions proposed, and the orderly, the decent, the civil, the safe, the noble effects thereof, will be soon convinced, and by degrees come in of their own accord, to be partakers of so happy a government.

THE
READY and EASY Way
To establish a
FREE COMMONWEALTH,
And the EXCELLENCE thereof,
Compared with the
INCONVENIENCIES and DANGERS
Of Re-admitting KINGSHIP in this Nation.

————— Et nos
Confilium dedimus Syllæ, demus populo nunc.

ALthough since the writing of this treatise, the face of things hath had some change, Writs for new elections have been recalled, and the members at first chosen, re-admitted from exclusion; yet not a little rejoicing to hear declared the resolution of those who are in power, tending to the establishment of a free commonwealth, and to remove, if it be possible, this noxious humour of returning to bondage, instilled of late by some deceivers, and nourished from bad principles and false apprehensions among too many of the people; I thought best not to suppress what I had written, hoping that it may now be of much more use and concernment to be freely published, in the midst of our elections to a free parliament, or their sitting to consider freely of the government; whom it behoves to have all things represented to them that may direct their judgment therein; and I never read of any state, scarce of any tyrant grown so incurable, as to refuse counsel from any in a time of publick deliberation, much less to be offended. If their absolute determination be to enthrall us, before so long a Lent of servitude, they may permit us a little shroving-time first, wherein to speak freely, and take our leaves of liberty. And because in the former edition, through haste, many faults escaped, and many books were suddenly dispersed, ere the note to mend them could be sent, I took the opportunity from this occasion to revise and somewhat to enlarge the whole discourse, especially that part which argues for a perpetual Senate. The treatise thus revised and enlarged, is as follows.

The Parliament of England, assisted by a great number of the people who appeared and stuck to them faithfullest in defence of religion and their civil liberties, judging kingship by long experience a government unnecessary, burdensome and dangerous,
justly

justly and magnanimously abolished it, turning regal bondage into a free commonwealth, to the admiration and terror of our emulous neighbours. They took themselves not bound by the light of nature or religion to any former covenant, from which the king himself, by many forfeitures of a latter date or discovery, and our own longer consideration thereon, had more and more unbound us, both to himself and his posterity; as hath been ever the justice and the prudence of all wise nations that have ejected tyranny. They covenanted "to preserve the king's person and authority, in the preservation of the true religion, and our liberties;" not in his endeavouring to bring in upon our consciences, a popish religion; upon our liberties, thralldom; upon our lives, destruction, by his occasioning, if not complotting, as was after discovered, the Irish massacre; his fomenting and arming the rebellion; his covert leaguings with the rebels against us; his refusing, more than seven times, propositions most just and necessary to the true religion and our liberties, tendered him by the parliament both of England and Scotland. They made not their covenant concerning him with no difference between a king and a God; or promised him, as Job did to the Almighty, "to trust in him though he slay us:" They understood that the solemn engagement, wherein we all forswore kingship, was no more a breach of the covenant, than the covenant was of the protestation before, but a faithful and prudent going on both in words well weighed, and in the true sense of the covenant, "without respect of persons," when we could not serve two contrary masters, God and the king, or the king and that more supreme law, sworn in the first place to maintain our Safety and our liberty. They knew the people of England to be a free people, themselves the representers of that freedom; and although many were excluded, and as many fled (so they pretended) from tumults to Oxford, yet they were left a sufficient number to act in parliament, therefore not bound by any statute of preceding parliaments, but by the law of nature only, which is the only law of laws truly and properly to all mankind fundamental; the beginning and the end of all government; to which no parliament or people that will thoroughly reform, but may and must have recourse, as they had, and must yet have, in church-reformation (if they thoroughly intend it) to evangelic rules; not to ecclesiastical canons, though never so ancient, so ratified and established in the land by statutes, which for the most part are meer positive laws, neither natural nor moral; and so by any parliament, for just and serious considerations, without scruple to be at any time repealed. If others of their number in these things were under force, they were not, but under free conscience; if others were excluded by a power which they could not resist, they were not therefore to leave the helm of government in no hands, to discontinue their care of the public peace and safety, to desert the people in anarchy and confusion, no more than when so many of their members left them, as made up in outward formality a more legal parliament of three estates against them. The best-affected also, and best-principled of the people, stood not numbering or computing, on which side were most voices in parliament, but on which side appeared to them most reason, most safety, when the house divided upon main matters: What was well motioned and advised, they examined not whether fear or persuasion carried it in the vote, neither did they measure votes and counsels by the intentions of them that voted; knowing that intentions either are but guessed at, or not soon enough known; and although good, can neither make the deed such, nor prevent the consequence from being bad: Suppose bad intentions in things otherwise well done; what was well done, was by them who so thought, not the less obeyed or followed in the state; since in the church, who had not rather follow Iscariot or Simon the magician, though to covetous ends, preaching, than Saul, though in the uprightness of his heart persecuting the gospel? Safer they therefore judged what they thought the better counsels, though carried on by some perhaps to bad ends, than the worse by others, though endeavoured with best intentions: and yet they were not to learn that a greater number might be corrupt within the walls of a parliament, as well as of a city; whereof in

matters of nearest concernment all men will be judges; nor easily permit, that the odds of voices in their greatest council, shall more endanger them by corrupt or credulous votes, than the odds of enemies by open assaults; judging that most voices ought not always to prevail where main matters are in question. If others hence will pretend to disturb all counsels; what is that to them who pretend not, but are in real danger; not they only so judging, but a great, though not the greatest number of their chosen patriots, who might be more in weight than the others in number: there being in number little virtue, but by weight and measure wisdom working all things, and the dangers on either side they seriously thus weighed. From the treaty, short fruits of long labours, and seven years war; security for twenty years, if we can hold it; reformation in the church for three years: then put to shift again with our vanquished master. His justice, his honour, his conscience declared quite contrary to ours; which would have furnished him with many such evasions, as in a Book entitled, "An Inquisition for blood," soon after were not concealed: Bishops not totally removed, but left, as it were, in ambush, a reserve, with ordination in their sole power; their lands already sold, not to be alienated, but rented, and the sale of them called "Sacrilege;" Delinquents, few of many brought to condign punishment; Accessories punished; the chief author, above pardon, though after utmost resistance, vanquished; not to give, but to receive laws; yet besought, treated with, and to be thanked for his gracious concessions, to be honoured, worshipped, glorified. If this we swore to do, with what righteousness in the sight of God, with what assurance that we bring not by such an oath, the whole sea of blood-guiltiness upon our heads? If on the other side we prefer a free government, though for the present not obtained, yet all those suggested fears and difficulties, as the event will prove, easily overcome, we remain finally secure from the exasperated regal power, and out of snares; shall retain the best part of our liberty, which is our religion, and the civil part will be from these who defer us, much more easily recovered, being neither so futtle nor so awful as a king re-inthroned. Nor were their actions less both at home and abroad, than might become the hopes of a glorious rising commonwealth: Nor were the expressions both of army and people, whether in their public declarations, or several writings, other than such as testified a spirit in this nation, no less noble and well fitted to the liberty of a commonwealth, than in the ancient Greeks or Romans. Nor was the heroic cause unsuccessfully defended to all Christendom, against the tongue of a famous and thought invincible adversary; nor the constancy and fortitude that so nobly vindicated our liberty, our victory at once against two the most prevailing usurpers over mankind, superstition and tyranny, unpraised or uncelebrated in a written monument, likely to outlive detraction, as it hath hitherto convinced or silenced not a few of our detractors, especially in parts abroad. After our liberty and religion thus prosperously fought for, gained, and many years possessed, except in those unhappy interruptions, which God hath removed; now that nothing remains, but in all reason the certain hopes of a speedy and immediate settlement for ever in a firm and free commonwealth, for this extolled and magnified nation, regardless both of honour won, or deliverances vouchsafed from Heaven, to fall back, or rather to creep back so poorly, as it seems the multitude would, to their once abjured and detested thralldom of kingship, to be ourselves the slanderers of our own just and religious deeds, though done by some to covetous and ambitious ends, yet not therefore to be stained with their infamy, or they to asperse the integrity of others; and yet these now by revolting from the conscience of deeds well done, both in church and state, to throw away and forsake, or rather to betray a just and noble cause for the mixture of bad men who have ill-managed and abused it, (which had our fathers done heretofore, and on the same pretence deserted true religion, what had long ere this become of our gospel, and all protestant reformation so much intermixt with the avarice and ambition of some reformers?) and by thus relapsing,

lapsing, to verify all the bitter predictions of our triumphing enemies, who will now think they wisely discerned and justly censured both us and all our actions as rash, rebellious, hypocritical and impious; not only argues a strange degenerate contagion suddenly spread among us, fitted and prepared for new slavery, but will render us a scorn and derision to all our neighbours. And what will they at best say of us, and of the whole English name, but scoffingly, as of that foolish builder mentioned by our Saviour, who began to build a tower, and was not able to finish it? Where is this goodly tower of a commonwealth, which the English boasted they would build to overshadow kings, and be another Rome in the west? The foundation indeed they laid gallantly, but fell into a worse confusion, not of tongues, but of factions, than those at the tower of Babel; and have left no memorial of their work behind them remaining, but in the common laughter of Europe! Which must needs redound the more to our shame, if we but look on our neighbours the United Provinces, to us inferior in all outward advantages; who notwithstanding, in the midst of greater difficulties, courageously, wisely, constantly went through with the same work, and are settled in all the happy enjoyments of a potent and flourishing republic to this day.

Besides this, if we return to kingship, and soon repent, (as undoubtedly we shall, when we begin to find the old encroachments coming on by little and little upon our consciences, which must necessarily proceed from king and bishop united inseparably in one interest,) we may be forced perhaps to fight over again all that we have fought, and spend over again all that we have spent, but are never like to attain thus far as we are now advanced to the recovery of our freedom, never to have it in possession as we now have it, never to be vouchsafed hereafter the like mercies and signal assistances from heaven in our cause, if by our ingrateful backsliding we make these fruitless; flying now to regal concessions from his divine condescensions, and gracious answers to our once importuning prayers against the tyranny which we then groaned under; making vain and viler than dirt, the blood of so many thousand faithful and valiant Englishmen, who left us in this liberty, bought with their lives; losing by a strange after-game of folly, all the battles we have won, together with all Scotland as to our conquest, hereby lost, which never any of our kings could conquer, all the treasure we have spent, not that corruptible treasure only, but that far more precious of all our late miraculous deliverances; treading back again with lost labour, all our happy steps in the progress of reformation, and most pitifully depriving ourselves the instant fruition of that free government which we have so dearly purchased, a free commonwealth, not only held by wisest men in all ages the noblest, the manliest, the equallest, the justest government, the most agreeable to all due liberty and proportioned equality, both human, civil, and christian, most cherishing to virtue and true religion, but also (I may say it with greatest probability) plainly commended, or rather enjoined by our Saviour himself, to all christians, not without remarkable disallowance, and the brand of Gentilism upon kingship. God in much displeasure gave a king to the Israelites, and imputed it a sin to them that they sought one: But Christ apparently forbids his disciples to admit of any such heathenish government; "The kings of the Gentiles," saith he, "exercise lordship over them;" and they that "exercise authority upon them are called benefactors: but ye shall not be so; but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that serveth." The occasion of these his words was the ambitious desire of Zebedee's two sons, to be exalted above their brethren in his kingdom, which they thought was to be e'er long upon earth. That he speaks of civil government, is manifest by the former part of the comparison, which infers the other part to be always in the same kind. And what government comes nearer to this precept of Christ, than a free commonwealth; wherein they who are greatest, are perpetual servants and drudges to the public at their own cost and charges, neglect their own affairs, yet are not elevated above their brethren; live soberly in their families, walk the street as other men,

may

may be spoken to freely, familiarly, friendly, without adoration? Whereas a king must be adored like a demigod, with a dissolute and haughty court about him, of vast expence and luxury, masks and revels, to the debauching of our prime gentry both male and female; not in their pastimes only, but in earnest, by the loose employments of court-service, which will be then thought honourable. There will be a queen of no less charge; in most likelihood outlandish and a papist, besides a queen-mother such already; together with both their courts and numerous train: then a royal issue, and e'er long severally their sumptuous courts; to the multiplying of a servile crew, not of servants only, but of nobility and gentry, bred up then to the hopes not of public, but of court-offices, to be stewards, chamberlains, ushers, grooms, even of the close-stool; and the lower their minds debased with court-opinions, contrary to all virtue and reformation, the haughtier will be their pride and profuseness. We may well remember this not long since at home; nor need but look at present into the French court, where enticements and preferments daily draw away and pervert the protestant nobility. As to the burden of expence, to our cost we shall soon know it; for any good to us deserving to be termed no better than the vast and lavish price of our subjection, and their debauchery, which we are now so greedily cheapening, and would so fain be paying most inconsiderately to a single person; who for any thing wherein the public really needs him, will have little else to do, but to bestow the eating and drinking of excessive dainties, to set a pompous face upon the superficial actings of state, to pageant himself up and down in progress among the perpetual bowings and cringings of an abject people, on either side deifying and adoring him for nothing done that can deserve it. For what can he more than another man? who even in the expression of a late court-poet, sits only like a great cypher set to no purpose before a long row of other significant figures. Nay, it is well and happy for the people if their king be but a cypher, being oft-times a mischief, a pest, a scourge of the nation, and which is worse, not to be removed, not to be controuled, much less accused or brought to punishment, without the danger of a common ruin, without the shaking and almost subversion of the whole land: whereas in a free commonwealth, any governor or chief counsellor offending, may be removed and punished, without the least commotion. Certainly then that people must needs be mad, or strangely infatuated, that build the chief hope of their common happiness or safety on a single person; who if he happen to be good, can do no more than another man; if to be bad, hath in his hands to do more evil without check, than millions of other men. The happiness of a nation must needs be firmest and certainest in full and free council of their own electing, where no single person, but reason only sways. And what madness is it for them who might manage nobly their own affairs themselves, sluggishly and weakly to devolve all on a single person; and more like boys under age than men, to commit all to his patronage and disposal, who neither can perform what he undertakes, and yet for undertaking it, though royally paid, will not be their servant, but their lord? How unmanly must it needs be, to count such a one the breath of our nostrils, to hang all our felicity on him, all our safety, our well-being, for which if we were ought else but sluggards or babies, we need depend on none but God and our own counsels, our own active virtue and industry? "Go to the ant, thou sluggard," saith Solomon; "consider her ways, and be wise; which having no prince, ruler, or lord, provides her meat in the summer, and gathers her food in the harvest:" which evidently shews us, that they who think the nation undone without a king, though they look grave or haughty, have not so much true spirit and understanding in them as a pismire: neither are these diligent creatures hence concluded to live in lawless anarchy, or that commended, but are set the examples to imprudent and ungoverned men, of a frugal and self-governing democracy or commonwealth; safer and more thriving in the joint providence and counsel of many industrious equals, than under the single domination of one imperious lord. It may be well wondered that any nation styling themselves free,

free, can suffer any man to pretend hereditary right over them as their lord; whenas by acknowledging that right, they conclude themselves his servants and his vassals, and so renounce their own freedom. Which how a people and their leaders especially can do, who have fought so gloriously for liberty; how they can change their noble words and actions, heretofore so becoming the majesty of a free people, into the base necessity of court-flatteries and prostrations, is not only strange and admirable, but lamentable to think on. That a nation should be so valorous and courageous to win their liberty in the field, and when they have won it, should be so heartless and unwise in their counsels, as not to know how to use it, value it, what to do with it, or with themselves; but after ten or twelve years prosperous war and contestation with tyranny, basely and besottedly to run their necks again into the yoke which they have broken, and prostrate all the fruits of their victory for naught at the feet of the vanquished, besides our loss of glory, and such an example as kings or tyrants never yet had the like to boast of, will be an ignominy if it befall us, that never yet befel any nation possessed of their liberty; worthy indeed themselves, whatsoever they be, to be for ever slaves, but that part of the nation which consents not with them, as I persuade me of a great number, far worthier than by their means to be brought into the same bondage. Considering these things so plain, so rational, I cannot but yet further admire on the other side, how any man who hath the true principles of justice and religion in him, can presume or take upon him to be a king and lord over his brethren, whom he cannot but know whether as men or christians, to be for the most part every way equal or superior to himself: how he can display with such vanity and ostentation his regal splendor, so supereminently above other mortal men; or being a christian, can assume such extraordinary honour and worship to himself, while the kingdom of Christ our common king and lord, is hid to this world, and such Gentilish imitation forbid in express words by himself to all his disciples. All protestants hold that Christ in his church hath left no vicegerent of his power; but himself without deputy, is the only head thereof, governing it from heaven: how then can any christian man derive his kingship from Christ, but with worse usurpation than the pope his headship over the church, since Christ not only hath not left the least shadow of a command for any such vicegerence from him in the state, as the pope pretends for his in the church, but hath expressly declared, that such regal dominion is from the Gentiles, not from him, and hath strictly charged us not to imitate them therein?

I doubt not but all ingenuous and knowing men will easily agree with me, that a free commonwealth without single person, or house of lords, is by far the best government if it can be had; but we have all this while, say they, been expecting it, and cannot yet attain it. 'Tis true indeed, when monarchy was dissolved, the form of a commonwealth should have forthwith been framed, and the practice thereof immediately begun; that the people might have soon been satisfied and delighted with the decent order, ease, and benefit thereof: we had been then by this time firmly rooted past fear of commotions or mutations, and now flourishing: this care of timely settling a new government instead of the old, too much neglected, hath been our mischief. Yet the cause thereof may be ascribed with most reason to the frequent disturbances, interruptions, and dissolutions which the parliament hath had, partly from the impatient or disaffected people, partly from some ambitious leaders in the army; much contrary, I believe, to the mind and approbation of the army itself and their other commanders, once undeceived, or in their own power. Now is the opportunity, now the very season wherein we may obtain a free commonwealth, and establish it for ever in the land, without difficulty or much delay. Writs are sent out for elections, and which is worth observing; in the name, not of any king, but of the keepers of our liberty, to summon a free parliament; which then only will indeed be free, and deserve the true honour of that supreme title, if they preserve us a free people. Which never parliament was more free to do; being now cal-

led, not as heretofore, by the summons of a king, but by the voice of liberty: and if the people, laying aside prejudice and impatience, will seriously and calmly now consider their own good, both religious and civil, their own liberty and the only means thereof, as shall be here laid down before them, and will elect their knights and burgessees able men, and according to the just and necessary qualifications (which, for aught I hear, remain yet in force unrepealed, as they were formerly decreed in parliament) men not addicted to a single person or house of lords, the work is done; at least the foundation firmly laid of a free commonwealth, and good part also erected of the main structure. For the ground and basis of every just and free government (since men have smarted so oft for committing all to one person) is a general council of ablest men, chosen by the people to consult of public affairs from time to time for the common good. In this grand council must the sovereignty, not transferred, but delegated only, and as it were deposited, reside; with this caution they must have the forces by sea and land committed to them for preservation of the common peace and liberty; must raise and manage the public revenue, at least with some inspectors deputed for satisfaction of the people, how it is employed; must make or propose, as more expressly shall be said anon, civil laws, treat of commerce, peace, or war with foreign nations, and for the carrying on some particular affairs with more secrecy and expedition, must elect, as they have already out of their own number and others, a council of state.

And although it may seem strange at first hearing, by reason that mens minds are prepossessed with the notion of successive parliaments, I affirm that the grand or general council being well chosen, should be perpetual: for so their business is or may be, and oft-times urgent; the opportunity of affairs gained or lost in a moment. The day of council cannot be set as the day of a festival; but must be ready always to prevent or answer all occasions. By this continuance they will become every way skilfullest, best provided of intelligence from abroad, best acquainted with the people at home, and the people with them. The ship of the commonwealth is always under sail; they sit at the stern, and if they steer well, what need is there to change them, it being rather dangerous? Add to this, that the grand council is both foundation and main pillar of the whole state; and to move pillars and foundations, not faulty, cannot be safe for the building. I see not therefore, how we can be advantaged by successive and transitory parliaments; but that they are much likelier continually to unsettle rather than to settle a free government, to breed commotions, changes, novelties and uncertainties, to bring neglect upon present affairs and opportunities, while all minds are in suspense with expectation of a new assembly, and the assembly for a good space taken up with the new settling of itself. After which, if they find no great work to do, they will make it, by altering or repealing former acts, or making and multiplying new; that they may seem to see what their predecessors saw not, and not to have assembled for nothing: till all law be lost in the multitude of clashing statutes. But if the ambition of such as think themselves injured that they also partake not of the government, and are impatient till they be chosen, cannot brook the perpetuity of others chosen before them; or if it be feared that long continuance of power may corrupt sincerest men, the known expedient is, and by some lately propounded, that annually (or if the space be longer, so much perhaps the better) the third part of senators may go out according to the precedence of their election, and the like number be chosen in their places, to prevent their settling of too absolute a power, if it should be perpetual: and this they call "partial Rotation." But I could wish that this wheel or partial wheel in state, if it be possible, might be avoided, as having too much affinity with the wheel of fortune. For it appears not how this can be done, without danger and mischance of putting out a great number of the best and ablest: In whose stead new elections may bring in as many raw, unexperienced and otherwise affected, to the weakning and much altering for the worse of public transactions. Neither do I think a perpetual senate, especially chosen or entrusted by the people,

people, much in this land to be feared, where the well-affected either in a standing army, or in a settled militia, have their arms in their own hands. Safest therefore to me it seems, and of least hazard or interruption to affairs, that none of the grand council be moved, unless by death or just conviction of some crime: for what can be expected firm or steadfast from a floating foundation? however, I forejudge not any probable expedient, any temperament that can be found in things of this nature so disputable on either side. Yet lest this which I affirm, be thought my single opinion, I shall add sufficient testimony. Kingship itself is therefore counted the more safe and durable, because the king, and for the most part his council, is not changed during life: but a commonwealth is held immortal, and therein firmest, safest and most above fortune: for the death of a king causeth oft-times many dangerous alterations; but the death now and then of a senator is not felt, the main body of them still continuing permanent in greatest and noblest commonwealths, and as it were eternal. Therefore among the Jews, the supreme council of seventy, called the Sanhedrim, founded by Moses, in Athens that of Areopagus, in Sparta that of the ancients, in Rome the senate, consisted of members chosen for term of life; and by that means remained as it were still the same to generations. In Venice they change indeed oftener than every year some particular council of state, as that of six, or such other: but the true senate, which upholds and sustains the government, is the whole aristocracy immovable. So in the United Provinces, the states general, which are indeed but a council of state deputed by the whole union, are not usually the same persons for above three or six years; but the states of every city in whom the sovereignty hath been placed time out of mind, are a standing senate, without succession, and accounted chiefly in that regard the main prop of their liberty. And why they should be so in every well-ordered commonwealth, they who write of policy, give these reasons; "That to make the senate successive, not only impairs the dignity and lustre of the senate, but weakens the whole commonwealth, and brings it into manifest danger; while by this means the secrets of state are frequently divulged, and matters of greatest consequence committed to inexpert and novice counsellors, utterly to seek in the full and intimate knowledge of affairs past." I know not therefore what should be peculiar in England to make successive parliaments thought safest, or convenient here more than in other nations, unless it be the fickleness which is attributed to us as we are islanders: but good education and acquire wisdom ought to correct the fluxible fault, if any such be, of our watry situation. It will be objected, that in those places where they had perpetual senates, they had also popular remedies against their growing too imperious: as in Athens, besides Areopagus, another senate of four or five hundred; in Sparta, the Ephori; in Rome, the tribunes of the people. But the event tells us, that these remedies either little avail the people, or brought them to such a licentious and unbridled democracy, as in fine ruined themselves with their own excessive power. So that the main reason urged why popular assemblies are to be trusted with the people's liberty, rather than a senate of principal men, because great men will be still endeavouring to enlarge their power, but the common sort will be contented to maintain their own liberty, is by experience found false; none being more immoderate and ambitious to amplify their power, than such popularities, which were seen in the people of Rome; who at first contented to have their tribunes, at length contended with the senate that one consul, then both, soon after, that the censors and prætors also should be created Plebeian, and the whole empire put into their hands; adoring lastly those, who most were adverse to the senate, till Marius by fulfilling their inordinate desires, quite lost them all the power for which they had so long been striving, and left them under the tyranny of Sylla: the balance therefore must be exactly so set, as to preserve and keep up due authority on either side, as well in the senate as in the people. And this annual rotation of a senate to consist of three hundred, as is lately propounded, requires also another popular assembly upward of a thousand, with an answerable rotation. Which,

besides that it will be liable to all those inconveniencies found in the foresaid remedies, cannot but be troublesome and chargeable, both in their motion and their session, to the whole land, unweildy with their own bulk, unable in so great a number to mature their consultations as they ought, if any be allotted them, and that they meet not from so many parts remote to sit a whole year lieger in one place, only now and then to hold up a forest of fingers, or to convey each man his bean or ballot into the box, without reason shewn or common deliberation; incontinent of secrets, if any be imparted to them; emulous and always jarring with the other senate. The much better way doubtless will be, in this wavering condition of our affairs, to defer the changing or circumscribing of our senate, more than may be done with ease, till the commonwealth be thoroughly settled in peace and safety, and they themselves give us the occasion. Military men hold it dangerous to change the form of battle in view of an enemy: neither did the people of Rome bandy with their senate while any of the Tarquins lived, the enemies of their liberty, nor fought by creating tribunes to defend themselves against the fear of their patricians, till sixteen years after the expulsion of their kings, and in full security of their state, they had or thought they had just cause given them by the senate. Another way will be, to well qualify and refine elections: not committing all to the noise and shouting of a rude multitude, but permitting only those of them who are rightly qualified, to nominate as many as they will; and out of that number others of a better breeding, to chuse a less number more judiciously, till after a third or fourth sifting and refining of exactest choice, they only be left chosen who are the due number, and seem by most voices the worthiest. To make the people fittest to chuse, and the chosen fittest to govern, will be to mend our corrupt and faulty education, to teach the people faith not without virtue, temperance, modesty, sobriety, parsimony, justice; not to admire wealth or honour; to hate turbulence and ambition; to place every one his private welfare and happiness in the public peace, liberty and safety. They shall not then need to be much mistrustful of their chosen patriots in the grand council; who will be then rightly called the true keepers of our liberty, though the most of their business will be in foreign affairs. But to prevent all mistrust, the people then will have their several ordinary assemblies (which will henceforth quite annihilate the odious power and name of committees) in the chief towns of every county, without the trouble, charge, or time lost of summoning and assembling from far in so great a number, and so long residing from their own houses, or removing of their families, to do as much at home in their several shires, entire or subdivided, toward the securing of their liberty, as a numerous assembly of them all formed and convened on purpose with the wariest Rotation. Whereof I shall speak more ere the end of this discourse: for it may be referred to time, so we be still going on by degrees to perfection. The people well weighing and performing these things, I suppose would have no cause to fear, though the Parliament abolishing that name as originally signifying but the Parly of our lords and commons with the Norman king when he pleased to call them, should with certain limitations of their power, sit perpetual, if their ends be faithful and for a free commonwealth, under the name of a grand or general council. Till this be done, I am in doubt whether our state will be ever certainly and thoroughly settled; never likely till then to see an end of our troubles and continual changes, or at least never the true settlement and assurance of our liberty. The grand council being thus firmly constituted to perpetuity, and still, upon the death or default of any member, supplied and kept in full number, there can be no cause alledged why peace, justice, plentiful trade, and all prosperity should not thereupon ensue throughout the whole land; with as much assurance as can be of human things, that they shall so continue (if God favour us, and our wilful sins provoke him not) even to the coming of our true and rightful, and only to be expected king, only worthy as he is our only Saviour, the Messiah, the Christ, the only heir of his eternal father, the only by him anointed and ordained since the work of our redemption

finished, universal Lord of all mankind. The way propounded is plain, easy and open before us; without intricacies, without the introduction of new or absolute forms or terms, or exotic models; ideas that would effect nothing; but with a number of new injunctions to manacle the native liberty of mankind; turning all virtue into prescription, servitude, and necessity, to the great impairing and frustrating of christian liberty. I say again, this way lies free and smooth before us; is not tangled with inconveniences; invents no new incumbrances; requires no perilous, no injurious alteration or circumscription of mens lands and properties; secure, that in this commonwealth, temporal and spiritual lords removed, no man or number of men can attain to such wealth or vast possession, as will need the hedge of an agrarian law (never successful, but the cause rather of sedition, save only where it began seasonably with first possession) to confine them from endangering our public liberty. To conclude, it can have no considerable objection made against it, that it is not practicable; lest it be said hereafter, that we gave up our liberty for want of a ready way or distinct form proposed of a free commonwealth. And this facility we shall have above our next neighbouring commonwealth (if we can keep us from the fond conceit of something like a duke of Venice, put lately into many mens heads by some one or other suttly driving on under that notion his own ambitious ends to lurch a crown) that our liberty shall not be hampered or hovered over by any engagement to such a potent family as the house of Nassau, of whom to stand in perpetual doubt and suspicion, but we shall live the clearest and absolute free nation in the world.

On the contrary, if there be a king, which the inconsiderate multitude are now so mad upon, mark how far short we are like to come of all those happineffes, which in a free state we shall immediately be possessed of. First, the grand council, which as I shewed before, should sit perpetually (unless their leisure give them now and then some intermissions or vacations, easily manageable by the council of state left sitting) shall be called by the king's good will and utmost endeavour, as seldom as may be. For it is only the king's right, he will say, to call a parliament; and this he will do most commonly about his own affairs rather than the kingdom's, as will appear plainly so soon as they are called. For what will their business then be, and the chief expence of their time, but an endless tugging between petition of right and royal prerogative, especially about the negative voice, militia, or subsidies, demanded and oft-times extorted without reasonable cause appearing to the commons, who are the only true representatives of the people and their liberty, but will be then mingled with a court-faction; besides which, within their own walls, the sincere part of them who stand faithful to the people, will again have to deal with two troublesome counter-working adversaries from without, meer creatures of the king, spiritual, and the greater part, as is likeliest, of temporal lords, nothing concerned with the people's liberty. If these prevail not in what they please, though never so much against the people's interest, the parliament shall be soon dissolved, or sit and do nothing; not suffered to remedy the least grievance, or enact aught advantageous to the people. Next, the council of state shall not be chosen by the parliament, but by the king, still his own creatures, courtiers and favourites; who will be sure in all their counsels to set their master's grandeur and absolute power, in what they are able, far above the people's liberty. I deny not but that there may be such a king, who may regard the common good before his own, may have no vicious favourite, may hearken only to the wisest and incorruptest of his parliament: but this rarely happens in a monarchy not elective; and it behoves not a wise nation to commit the sum of their well-being, the whole state of their safety to fortune. What need they; and how absurd would it be, whenas they themselves to whom his chief virtue will be but to hearken, may with much better management and dispatch, with much more commendation of their own worth and magnanimity, govern without a master? Can the folly be paralleled, to adore and be the slaves of a single person, for doing that which it is ten thousand to one whe-

ther he can or will do, and we without him might do more easily, more effectually, more laudably, our selves? Shall we never grow old enough to be wise, to make seasonable use of gravest authorities, experiences, examples? Is it such an unspeakable joy to serve, such felicity to wear a yoke? to clink our shackles, locked on by pretended law of subjection, more intolerable and hopeless to be ever shaken off, than those which are knocked on by illegal injury and violence? Aristotle, our chief instructor in the universities, lest this doctrine be thought Sectarian, as the royalist would have it thought, tells us in the third of his politics, that certain men at first, for the matchless excellence of their virtue above others, or some great public benefit, were created kings by the people; in small cities and territories, and in the scarcity of others to be found like them; but when they abused their power, and governments grew larger, and the number of prudent men increased, that then the people soon deposing their tyrants, betook them, in all civillest places, to the form of a free commonwealth. And why should we thus disparage and prejudicate our own nation, as to fear a scarcity of able and worthy men united in counsel to govern us, if we will but use diligence and impartiality to find them out and chuse them, rather yoking ourselves to a single person, the natural adversary and oppressor of liberty; though good, yet far easier corruptible by the excess of his single power and exaltation, or at best, not comparably sufficient to bear the weight of government, nor equally disposed to make us happy in the enjoyment of our liberty under him?

But admit, that monarchy of itself may be convenient to some nations; yet to us who have thrown it out, received back again, it cannot but prove pernicious. For kings to come, never forgetting their former ejection, will be sure to fortify and arm themselves sufficiently for the future against all such attempts hereafter from the people: who shall be then so narrowly watched and kept so low, that though they would never so fain, and at the same rate of their blood and treasure, they never shall be able to regain what they now have purchased and may enjoy, or to free themselves from any yoke imposed upon them: nor will they dare to go about it; utterly disheartened for the future, if these their highest attempts prove unsuccessful; which will be the triumph of all tyrants hereafter over any people that shall resist oppression; and their song will then be, to others, how sped the rebellious English? to our posterity, how sped the rebels your fathers? This is not my conjecture, but drawn from God's known denouncement against the gentlizing Israelites, who though they were governed in a commonwealth of God's own ordaining, he only their king, they his peculiar people, yet affecting rather to resemble heathen, but pretending the misgovernment of Samuel's sons, no more a reason to dislike their commonwealth, than the violence of Eli's sons was imputable to that priesthood or religion, clamoured for a king. They had their longing, but with this testimony of God's wrath; "Ye shall cry out in that day, because of your king whom ye shall have chosen, and the Lord will not hear you in that day." Us if he shall hear now, how much less will he hear when we cry hereafter, who once delivered by him from a king, and not without wondrous acts of his providence, insensible and unworthy of those high mercies, are returning precipitantly, if we withhold us not, back to the captivity from whence he freed us. Yet neither shall we obtain or buy at an easy rate this new gilded yoke which thus transports us: a new royal revenue must be found, a new episcopal; for those are individual: both which being wholly dissipated or bought by private persons, or assigned for service done, and especially to the army, cannot be recovered without general detriment and confusion to mens estates, or a heavy imposition on all mens purses; benefit to none but to the worst and ignoblest sort of men, whose hope is to be either the ministers of court riot and excess or the gainers by it: but not to speak more of losses and extraordinary levies on our estates, what will then be the revenges and offences remembered and returned, not only by the chief person, but by all his adherents; accounts and reparations that will be required, suits, indite-ments, inquiries, discoveries, complaints, informations, who knows against whom or
how

how many, though perhaps neuters, if not to utmost infliction, yet to imprisonment, fines, banishment, or molestation? if not these, yet disfavour, discountenance, disregard and contempt on all but the known royalist or whom he favours, will be plenteous. Nor let the new royalized presbyterians persuade themselves that their old doings, though now recanted, will be forgotten; whatever conditions be contrived or trusted on. Will they not believe this; nor remember the pacification how it was kept to the Scots; how other solemn promises many a time to us? Let them but now read the diabolical fore-running libels, the faces, the gestures that now appear foremost and briskest in all public places, as the harbingers of those that are in expectation to reign over us; let them but hear the insolencies, the menaces, the insultings of our newly animated common enemies crept lately out of their holes, their hell I might say, by the language of their infernal pamphlets, the spue of every drunkard, every ribald; nameless, yet not for want of licence, but for very shame of their own vile persons, not daring to name themselves, while they traduce others by name; and give us to foresee, that they intend to second their wicked words, if ever they have power, with more wicked deeds. Let our zealous backsliders forethink now with themselves, how their necks yoked with these tygers of Bacchus, these new fanatics of not the preaching but the sweating-tub, inspired with nothing holier than the venereal pox, can draw one way under monarchy to the establishing of church-discipline with these new-disgorged atheisms: yet shall they not have the honour to yoke with these, but shall be yoked under them; these shall plow on their backs. And do they among them who are so forward to bring in the single person, think to be by him trusted or long regarded? So trusted they shall be and so regarded, as by kings are wont reconciled enemies; neglected, and soon after discarded, if not prosecuted for old traytors; the first inciters, beginners, and more than to the third part actors of all that followed. It will be found also, that there must be then as necessarily as now (for the contrary part will be still feared) a standing army; which for certain shall not be this, but of the fiercest cavaliers, of no less expence, and perhaps again under Rupert. But let this army be sure they shall be soon disbanded, and likeliest without arrear or pay; and being disbanded, not be sure but they may as soon be questioned for being in arms against their king: the same let them fear, who have contributed money; which will amount to no small number that must then take their turn to be made delinquents and compounders. They who past reason and recovery are devoted to kingship, perhaps will answer, that a greater part by far of the nation will have it so, the rest therefore must yield. Not so much to convince these, which I little hope, as to confirm them who yield not, I reply; that this greatest part have both in reason, and the trial of just battle, lost the right of their election what the government shall be: of them who have not lost that right, whether they for kingship be the greater number, who can certainly determine? Suppose they be, yet of freedom they partake all alike, one main end of government: which if the greater part value not, but will degenerately forego, is it just or reasonable, that most voices against the main end of government, should enslave the less number that would be free? more just it is, doubtless, if it come to force, that a less number compel a greater to retain, which can be no wrong to them, their liberty, than that a greater number, for the pleasure of their baseness, compel a less most injuriously to be their fellow-slaves. They who seek nothing but their own just liberty, have always right to win it, and to keep it, whenever they have power, be the voices never so numerous that oppose it. And how much we above others are concerned to defend it from kingship, and from them who in pursuance thereof so perniciously would betray us and themselves to most certain misery and thralldom, will be needless to repeat.

Having thus far shewn with what ease we may now obtain a free commonwealth, and by it with as much ease all the freedom, peace, justice, plenty, that we can desire; on the other side, the difficulties, troubles, uncertainties, nay rather impossibilities to enjoy these things constantly under a monarch: I will now proceed to shew more particularly wherein

wherein our freedom and flourishing condition will be more ample and secure to us under a free commonwealth, than under kingship.

The whole freedom of man consists either in spiritual or civil liberty. As for spiritual, who can be at rest, who can enjoy any thing in this world with contentment, who hath not liberty to serve God, and to save his own soul, according to the best light which God hath planted in him to that purpose, by the reading of his revealed will, and the guidance of his holy spirit? That this is best pleasing to God, and that the whole protestant church allows no supreme judge or rule in matters of religion, but the scriptures; and these to be interpreted by the scriptures themselves, which necessarily infers liberty of conscience; I have heretofore proved at large in another treatise; and might yet further, by the public declarations, confessions and admonitions of whole churches and states, obvious in all histories since the reformation.

This liberty of conscience, which above all other things ought to be to all men dearest and most precious, no government more inclinable not to favour only, but to protect, than a free commonwealth; as being most magnanimous, most fearless and confident of its own fair proceedings. Whereas kingship, though looking big, yet indeed most pusillanimous, full of fears, full of jealousies, startled at every umbrage, as it hath been observed of old to have ever suspected most, and mistrusted them who were in most esteem for virtue and generosity of mind; so it is now known to have most in doubt and suspicion, them who are most reputed to be religious. Queen Elizabeth, though herself accounted so good a protestant, so moderate, so confident of her subjects love, would never give way so much as to presbyterian reformation in this land, though once and again besought, as Camden relates; but imprisoned, and persecuted the very proposers thereof; alledging it as her mind and maxim unalterable, that such reformation would diminish regal authority. What liberty of conscience can we then expect of others, far worse principled from the cradle, trained up and governed by Popish and Spanish counsels, and on such depending hitherto for subsistence? Especially what can this last parliament expect, who having revived lately and published the covenant, have re-engaged themselves, never to re-admit episcopacy? Which no son of Charles returning, but will most certainly bring back with him, if he regard the last and strictest charge of his father, "to persevere in, not the doctrine only, but government of the church of England; not to neglect the speedy and effectual suppressing of errors and schisms;" among which he accounted presbytery one of the chief. Or, if, notwithstanding that charge of his father, he submit to the covenant, how will he keep faith to us, with disobedience to him; or regard that faith given, which must be founded on the breach of that last and solemnest paternal charge, and the reluctance, I may say the antipathy, which is in all kings against presbyterian and independent discipline? For they hear the gospel speaking much of liberty; a word which monarchy and her bishops both fear and hate, but a free commonwealth both favours and promotes; and not the word only, but the thing itself. But let our governors beware in time, lest their hard measure to liberty of conscience be found the rock whereon they shipwreck themselves, as others have now done before them in the course wherein God was directing their steerage to a free commonwealth; and the abandoning of all those whom they call Sectaries, for the detected falsehood and ambition of some, be a wilful rejection of their own chief strength and interest in the freedom of all protestant religion, under what abusive name soever calumniated.

The other part of our freedom consists in the civil rights and advancements of every person according to his merit: the enjoyment of those never more certain, and the access to these never more open, than in a free commonwealth. Both which, in my opinion, may be best and soonest obtained, if every county in the land were made a kind of subordinate commonalty or commonwealth, and one chief town or more, according as the shire is in circuit, made cities,
if

if they be not so called already; where the nobility and chief gentry, from a proportionable compass of territory annexed to each city, may build houses or palaces befitting their quality, may bear part in the government, make their own judicial laws, or use these that are, and execute them by their own elected judicatures and judges without appeal, in all things of civil government between man and man: so they shall have justice in their own hands, law executed fully and finally in their own counties and precincts, long wished and spoken of, but never yet obtained; they shall have none then to blame but themselves, if it be not well administered; and fewer laws to expect or fear from the supreme authority; or to those that shall be made, of any great concernment to public liberty, they may, without much trouble in these commonalties, or in more general assemblies called to their cities from the whole territory on such occasion, declare and publish their assent or dissent by deputies, within a time limited, sent to the grand council; yet so as this their judgment declared, shall submit to the greater number of other counties or commonalties, and not avail them to any exemption of themselves, or refusal of agreement with the rest, as it may in any of the United Provinces, being sovereign within itself, oft-times to the great disadvantage of that union. In these employments they may much better than they do now, exercise and fit themselves till their lot fall to be chosen into the grand council, according as their worth and merit shall be taken notice of by the people. As for controversies that shall happen between men of several counties, they may repair, as they do now, to the capital city, or any other more commodious, indifferent place, and equal judges. And this I find to have been practised in the old Athenian Commonwealth, reputed the first and ancientest place of civility in all Greece: that they had in their several cities, a peculiar; in Athens a common government; and their right, as it befel them, to the administration of both. They should have here also schools and academies at their own choice, wherein their children may be bred up in their own sight to all learning and noble education; not in grammar only, but in all liberal arts and exercises. This would soon spread much more knowledge and civility, yea, religion, through all parts of the land, by communicating the natural heat of government and culture more distributively to all extreme parts, which now lie numb and neglected, would soon make the whole nation more industrious, more ingenuous at home; more potent, more honourable abroad. To this a free commonwealth will easily assent; (nay, the parliament hath had already some such thing in design) for of all governments a commonwealth aims most to make the people flourishing, virtuous, noble and high-spirited. Monarchs will never permit; whose aim is to make the people wealthy indeed perhaps, and well fleeced, for their own shearing, and the supply of regal prodigality; but otherwise softest, basest, viciousest, servilest, easiest to be kept under: and not only in fleece, but in mind also sheepishest; and will have all the benches of judicature annexed to the throne, as a gift of royal grace, that we have justice done us: whenas nothing can be more essential to the freedom of a people, than to have the administration of justice, and all public ornaments, in their own election, and within their own bounds, without long travelling or depending upon remote places to obtain their right, or any civil accomplishment; so it be not supreme, but subordinate to the general power and union of the whole republic. In which happy firmness, as in the particular above-mentioned, we shall also far exceed the United Provinces, by having, not as they (to the retarding and distracting oft-times of their counsels or urgentest occasions) many sovereignties united in one commonwealth, but many commonwealths under one united and entrusted sovereignty. And when we have our forces by sea and land, either of a faithful army, or a settled militia, in our own hands, to the firm establishing of a free commonwealth, public accounts under our own inspection, general laws and taxes, with their causes, in our own domestic suffrages, judicial laws, offices and ornaments at home in our own ordering and administration, all distinction of lords and commoners, that may any way divide or sever the public interest, removed; what can a perpetual senate have then, wherein to grow corrupt, wherein to encroach upon

upon us, or usurp? or if they do, wherein to be formidable? Yet if all this avail not to remove the fear or envy of a perpetual sitting, it may be easily provided, to change a third part of them yearly, or every two or three years, as was above-mentioned; or that it be at those times in the people's choice, whether they will change them, or renew their power, as they shall find cause.

I have no more to say at present: few words will save us, well considered; few and easy things, now seasonably done. But if the people be so affected, as to prostitute religion and liberty to the vain and groundless apprehension, that nothing but kingship can restore trade, not remembering the frequent plagues and pestilences that then wasted this city, such as through God's mercy we never have felt since; and that trade flourishes nowhere more than in the free commonwealths of Italy, Germany, and the Low-Countries, before their eyes at this day: yet if trade be grown so craving and importunate through the profuse living of tradesmen, that nothing can support it, but the luxurious expences of a nation upon trifles or superfluities; so as if the people generally should betake themselves to frugality, it might prove a dangerous matter, lest tradesmen should mutiny for want of trading; and that therefore we must forego and set to sale religion, liberty, honour, safety, all concerns divine or human, to keep up trading: If, lastly, after all this light among us, the same reason shall pass for current, to put our necks again under kingship, as was made use of by the Jews to return back to Egypt, and to the worship of their idol queen, because they falsely imagined that they then lived in more plenty and prosperity; our condition is not sound but rotten, both in religion and all civil prudence; and will bring us soon, the way we are marching, to those calamities which attend always and unavoidably on luxury, all national judgments under foreign and domestic slavery: So far we shall be from mending our condition by monarchizing our government, whatever new conceit now possesses us. However, with all hazard I have ventured what I thought my duty to speak in season, and to forewarn my country in time; wherein I doubt not but there be many wise men in all places and degrees, but am sorry the effects of wisdom are so little seen among us. Many circumstances and particulars I could have added in those things whereof I have spoken: but a few main matters now put speedily in execution, will suffice to recover us, and set all right: And there will want at no time who are good at circumstances; but men who set their minds on main matters, and sufficiently urge them, in these most difficult times I find not many. What I have spoken, is the language of that which is not called amiss "The good old Cause:" if it seem strange to any, it will not seem more strange, I hope, than convincing to back-sliders. Thus much I should perhaps have said, though I were sure I should have spoken only to trees and stones; and had none to cry to, but with the prophet, "O earth, earth, earth!" to tell the very soil itself what her perverse inhabitants are deaf to. Nay, though what I have spoke should happen (which thou suffer not, who didst create mankind free! nor thou next, who didst redeem us from being servants of men!) to be the last words of our expiring liberty. But I trust I shall have spoken persuasion to abundance of sensible and ingenuous men; to some perhaps whom God may raise to these stones to become children of reviving liberty; and may reclaim, though they seem now chusing them a captain back for Egypt, to bethink themselves a little, and consider whither they are rushing; to exhort this torrent also of the people, not to be so impetuous, but to keep their due channel; and at length recovering and uniting their better resolutions, now that they see already how open and unbounded the insolence and rage is of our common enemies, to stay these ruinous proceedings, justly and timely fearing to what a precipice of destruction the deluge of this epidemic madness would hurry us, through the general defection of a misguided and abused multitude.

BRIEF
NOTES
Upon a late
SERMON

TITLED,

The Fear of GOD and the KING;

Preached and since Published,

By MATTHEW GRIFFITH, D.D.

And Chaplain to the late KING.

Wherein many notorious Wreftings of Scripture, and other Falsities are observed.

I Affirmed in the preface of a late discourse, entitled, “The ready way to establish a Free Commonwealth, and the dangers of re-admitting kingship in this nation,” that the humour of returning to our old bondage, was instilled of late by some deceivers; and to make good, that what I then affirmed, was not without just ground, one of those deceivers I present here to the people: and if I prove him not such, refuse not to be so accounted in his stead.

He begins in his epistle to the general,* and moves cunningly for a licence to be admitted physician both to church and state; then sets out his practice in physical terms, “an wholesome electuary to be taken every morning next our hearts;” tells of the opposition which he met with from the college of state-physicians, then lays before you his drugs and ingredients; “Strong purgatives in the pulpit, contempered of the myrrh of mortification, the aloes of confession and contrition, the rubarb of restitution and satisfaction;” a pretty fantastic dose of divinity from a pulpit-mountebank, not unlike the fox, that turning pedlar, opened his pack of ware before the kid; though he now would seem, “to personate the good Samaritan,” undertaking to “describe the rise and progress of our national malady, and to prescribe the only remedy;” which how he performs, we shall quickly see.

First, he would suborn St. Luke as his spokesman to the general, presuming, it seems, “to have had as perfect understanding of things from the very first,” as the evangelist had of his gospel; that the general who hath so eminently borne his part in the whole action, “might know the certainty of those things” better from him a partial sequestred enemy; for so he presently appears, though covertly and like the tempter, commencing his address with an impudent calumny and affront to his excellence, that he

would be pleased "to carry on what he had so happily begun in the name and cause" not of God only, which we doubt not, but "of his anointed," meaning the late king's son; to charge him most audaciously and falsely with the renouncing of his own public promises and declarations, both to the parliament and the army, and we trust his actions e'er long will deter such insinuating slanderers from thus approaching him for the future. But the general may well excuse him; for the Comforter himself escapes not his presumption, avouched as falsely, to have impowered to those designs "him and him only, who hath solemnly declared the contrary. What Phanatic, against whom he so often inveighs, could more presumptuously affirm whom the comforter hath impowered, than this anti-fanatic, as he would be thought?

The Text.

Prov. xxiv. 21. "My son, fear God and the king, and meddle not with them that be seditious, or desirous of change," &c.

Letting pass matters not in controversy, I come to the main drift of your sermon, the King; which word here is either to signify any supreme magistrate, or else your latter object of fear is not universal, belongs not at all to many parts of Christendom, that have no king; and in particular not to us. That we have no king since the putting down of kingship in this commonwealth, is manifest by this last parliament, who to the time of their dissolving, not only made no address at all to any king, but summoned this next to come by the writ formerly appointed of a free commonwealth, without restitution or the least mention of any kingly right or power; which could not be, if there were at present any king of England. The main part therefore of your sermon, if it mean a king in the usual sense, is either impertinent and absurd, exhorting your auditory to fear that which is not; or if king here be, as it is understood, for any supreme magistrate, by your own exhortation they are in the first place not to meddle with you, as being yourself most of all the Seditious meant here, and the "desirous of change," in stirring them up to "fear a king," whom the present government takes no notice of.

You begin with a vain vision, "God and the King at the first blush" (which will not be your last blush) "seeming to stand in your text like those two cherubims on the mercy-seat, looking on each other." By this similitude, your conceited sanctuary, worse than the altar of Ahaz, patterned from Damascus, degrades God to a cherub, and raises your king to be his collateral in place, notwithstanding the other differences you put; which well agrees with the court-letters, lately published from this lord to the other lord, that cry him up for no less than angelical and celestial.

Your first observation, pag. 8. is, "That God and the king are coupled in the text, and what the Holy Ghost hath thus firmly combined, we may not, we must not dare to put asunder;" and yourself is the first man who puts them asunder by the first proof of your doctrine immediately following, Judg. vii. 20. which "couples the sword of the Lord and Gideon, a man who not only was no king, but refused to be a king or monarch, when it was offered him, in the very next chapter, ver. 22, 23. "I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you; the Lord shall rule over you." Here we see that this worthy heroic deliverer of his country, thought it best governed, if the Lord governed it in that form of a free commonwealth, which they then enjoyed without a single person. And thus is your first scripture, abused and most impertinently cited, nay, against yourself, to prove that "Kings at their coronation have a sword given them," which you interpret "the militia, the power of life and death put into their hands," against the declared judgment of our parliaments, nay, of all our laws, which reserve to themselves only the power of life and death, and render you in their just resentment of this boldness, another Dr. Manwaring.

Your next proof is as false and frivolous, "The king," say you, "is God's Sword-bearer;" true, but not the king only: for Gideon, by whom you seek to prove this, neither was, nor would be a king; and as you yourself confess, pag. 40. "There be divers forms of government. He bears not the sword in vain," Rom. xiii. 4. This also is as true of any lawful rulers, especially supreme; so that "Rulers," ver. 3. and therefore this present government, without whose authority you excite the people to a king, bear the sword as well as kings, and as little in vain. "They fight against God, who resist his ordinance, and go about to wrest the sword out of the hands of his anointed." This is likewise granted: but who is his Anointed? Not every king, but they only who were anointed or made kings by his special command; as Saul, David, and his race, which ended in the Messiah, (from whom no kings at this day can derive their title) Jehu, Cyrus, and if any other were by name appointed by him to some particular service: as for the rest of kings, all other supreme magistrates are as much the Lord's anointed as they; and our obedience commanded equally to them all; "for there is no power but of God, Rom. xiii. 1. and we are exhorted in the gospel to obey kings, as other magistrates, not that they are called any where the Lord's anointed, but as they are the "Ordinance of Man," 1 Pet. ii. 13. You therefore and other such false doctors, preaching kings to your auditory, as the Lord's only anointed, to withdraw people from the present government, by your own text are self-condemned, and not to be followed, not to be "meddled with," but to be noted, as most of all others the "feditious and desirous of change."

Your third proof is no less against yourself. Psal. cv. 15. "Touch not mine anointed." For this is not spoken in behalf of kings, but spoken to reprove kings, that they should not touch his anointed saints and servants, the seed of Abraham, as the verse next before might have taught you: he reproveth kings for their sakes, saying, "Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm;" according to that, 2 Cor. i. 21. "He who hath anointed us, is God." But how well you confirm one wrested scripture with another? 1 Sam. viii. 7. "They have not rejected thee, but me:" grossly misapplying these words, which were not spoken to any who had "resisted or rejected" a king, but to them who much against the will of God had sought a king, and rejected a commonwealth, wherein they might have lived happily under the reign of God only, their king. Let the words interpret themselves; ver. 6, 7. "But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, give us a king to judge us: and Samuel prayed unto the Lord. And the Lord said unto Samuel, hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee; for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them." Hence you conclude, "so indissoluble is the conjunction of God and the king." O notorious abuse of scripture! whenas you should have concluded, so unwilling was God to give them a king, so wide was the disjunction of God from a king. Is this the doctrine you boast of, to be "so clear in itself, and like a mathematical principle, that needs no farther demonstration?" Bad logic, bad mathematics (for principles can have no demonstration at all) but worse divinity. O people of an implicit faith no better than Romish, if these be thy prime teachers, who to their credulous audience dare thus juggle with scripture, to alledge those places for the proof of their doctrine, which are the plain refutation: and this is all the scripture which he brings to confirm his point.

The rest of his preachment is meer groundless chat, save here and there a few grains of corn scattered to intice the silly fowl into his net, interlaced here and there with some human reading, though slight, and not without geographical and historical mistakes: as pag. 29. Suevia the German dukedom, for Suecia the Northern kingdom: Philip of Macedon, who is generally understood of the great Alexander's father only, made contemporary, pag. 31. with T. Quintus the Roman commander, instead of T. Quintius, and the latter Philip: and pag. 44. Tully cited "in his third oration against Verres,"

to say of him, "that he was a wicked consul," who never was a consul: nor "Trojan sedition ever pourtrayed" by that verse of Virgil, which you cite pag. 47. as that of Troy: School-boys could have told you, that there is nothing of Troy in that whole pourtraiture, as you call it, of Sedition. These gross mistakes may justly bring in doubt your other loose citations, and that you take them up somewhere at the second or third hand rashly, and without due considering.

Nor are you happier in the relating or the moralizing your fable. "The frogs (BEING ONCE A FREE NATION, saith the Fable) "petitioned Jupiter for a king: he tumbled among them a log: they found it insensible; they petitioned then for a king that should be active: he sent them a crane" (a STORK, saith the fable) "which straight fell to pecking them up." This you apply to the reproof of them who desire change: whereas indeed the true moral shews rather the folly of those who being free seek a king; which for the most part either as a log lies heavy on his subjects, without doing aught worthy of his dignity and the charge to maintain him, or as a stork is ever pecking them up, and devouring them.

But by our fundamental laws, the king is the highest power," pag. 40. If we must hear mootings and law lectures from the pulpit, what shame is it for a doctor of divinity, not first to consider, that no law can be fundamental, but that which is grounded on the light of nature or right reason, commonly called moral Law: which no form of government was ever counted, but arbitrary, and at all times in the choice of every free people, or their representers? This choice of government is so essential to their freedom, that longer than they have it, they are not free. In this land not only the late king and his posterity, but kingship itself hath been abrogated by a law; which involves with as good reason the posterity of a king forfeited to the people, as that law heretofore of treason against the king, attainted the children with the father. This law against both king and kingship they who most question, do not less question all enacted without the king and his anti-parliament at Oxford, though called mungrel by himself. If no law must be held good, but what passes in full parliament, then surely in exactness of legality, no member must be missing: for look how many are missing, so many counties or cities that sent them want their representers. But if being once chosen, they serve for the whole nation, then any number which is sufficient, is full, and most of all in times of discord, necessity and danger. The king himself was bound by the old mode of parliaments, not to be absent, but in case of sickness, or some extraordinary occasion, and then to leave his substitute; much less might any member be allowed to absent himself. If the king then and many of the members with him, without leaving any in his stead, forsook the parliament upon a meer panic fear, as was that time judged by most men, and to levy war against them that sat, should they who were left sitting, break up, or not dare enact aught of nearest and presentest concernment to public safety, for the punctilio wanting of a full number, which no law-book in such extraordinary cases hath determined? Certainly if it were lawful for them to fly from their charge upon pretence of private safety, it was much more lawful for these to sit and act in their trust what was necessary for the public. By a law therefore of parliament, and of a parliament that conquered both Ireland, Scotland, and all their enemies in England, defended their friends, were generally acknowledged for a parliament both at home and abroad, kingship was abolished: This law now of late hath been negatively repealed; yet kingship not positively restored, and I suppose never was established by any certain law in this land, nor possibly could be: for how could our forefathers bind us to any certain form of government, more than we can bind our posterity? If a people be put to war with their king for his misgovernment, and overcome him, the power is then undoubtedly in their own hands how they will be governed. The war was granted just by the king himself at the beginning of his last treaty, and still maintained to be so by this last parliament, as appears by the qualification prescribed to the members of this next ensuing,

ensuing, That none shall be elected, who have borne arms against the parliament since 1641. If the war were just, the conquest was also just by the law of nations. And he who was the chief enemy, in all right ceased to be the king, especially after captivity, by the deciding verdict of war; and royalty with all her laws and pretensions, yet remains in the victor's power, together with the choice of our future government. Free commonwealths have been ever counted fittest and properest for civil, virtuous and industrious nations, abounding with prudent men worthy to govern: Monarchy fittest to curb degenerate, corrupt, idle, proud, luxurious people. If we desire to be of the former, nothing better for us, nothing nobler than a free commonwealth: if we will needs condemn ourselves to be of the latter, despairing of our own virtue, industry, and the number of our able men, we may then, conscious of our own unworthiness to be governed better, sadly betake us to our befitting thralldom: yet chusing out of our own number one who hath best aided the people, and best merited against tyranny, the space of a reign or two we may chance to live happily enough, or tolerably. But that a victorious people should give up themselves again to the vanquished, was never yet heard of; seems rather void of all reason and good policy, and will in all probability subject the subduers to the subdued, will expose to revenge, to beggary, to ruin and perpetual bondage, the victors under the vanquished: than which what can be more unworthy?

From misinterpreting our law, you return to do again the same with scripture, and would prove the supremacy of English kings from 1 Pet. ii. 13. as if that were the apostle's work: wherein if he saith that "the king is supreme," he speaks so of him but as an "ordinance of man," and in respect of those "governors that are sent by him," not in respect of parliaments, which by the law of this land are his bridle; in vain his bridle, if not also his rider: and therefore hath not only Co-ordination with him, which you falsely call seditious, but hath superiority above him, and that neither "against religion," nor "right Reason:" no nor against common law; for our kings reigned only by law. But the parliament is above all positive law, whether civil or common, makes or unmakes them both; and still the latter parliament above the former, above all the former lawgivers, then certainly above all precedent laws, entailed the crown on whom it pleased; and, as a great lawyer saith, "is so transcendent and absolute, that it cannot be confined either for causes or persons, within any bounds." But your cry is, no parliament without a king. If this be so, we have never had lawful kings, who have all been created kings either by such parliaments, or by conquest: if by such parliaments, they are in your allowance none: if by conquest, that conquest we have now conquered. So that as well by your own assertion as by ours, there can at present be no king. And how could that person be absolutely supreme, who reigned, not under law only, but under oath of his good demeanor, given to the people at his coronation, e'er the people gave him his crown? And his principal oath was to maintain those laws which the people should chuse. If then the law itself, much more he who was but the keeper and minister of law, was in their choice, and both he subordinate to the performance of his duty sworn, and our sworn allegiance in order only to his performance.

You fall next on the Consistorian Schismatics; for so you call Presbyterians, pag. 40. and judge them to have "enervated the king's supremacy by their opinions and practice, differing in many things only in terms from popery;" though some of those principles which you there cite concerning kingship, are to be read in Aristotle's politics, long e'er popery was thought on. The presbyterians therefore it concerns to be well forewarned of you betimes; and to them I leave you.

As for your examples of seditious men, pag. 54, &c. Cora, Absalom, Zimri, Sheba, to these you might with much more reason have added your own name, who "blow the trumpet of sedition" from your pulpit against the present government: in reward whereof they have sent you by this time, as I hear, to your "own Place," for preaching open sedition, while you would seem to preach against it.

As

As for your Appendix annex'd of the "Samaritan revived," finding it so foul a libel against all the well-affected of this land, since the very time of Ship-money, against the whole parliament, both lords and commons, except those that fled to Oxford, against the whole reformed church, not only in England and Scotland, but all over Europe (in comparison whereof you and your prelatical party are more truly schismatics and sectarians, nay, more properly Fanatics in your Fanes and gilded temples, than those whom you revile by those names) and meeting with no more scripture or solid reason in your "Samaritan wine and oil," than hath already been found sophisticated and adulterate, I leave your malignant narrative, as needing no other confutation, than the just censure already passed upon you by the council of state.

ACCEDEANCE

ACCEDENCE

COMMENCED

GRAMMAR,

Supplied with sufficient

RULES

For the Use of such as, Younger or Elder, are desirous, without more Trouble than needs, to attain the LATIN TONGUE; the elder Sort especially, with little Teaching, and their own Industry.

To the READER.

IT hath been long a general Complaint, not without cause, in the bringing up of youth, and still is, that the tenth part of man's life, ordinarily extended, is taken up in learning, and that very scarcely, the LATIN TONGUE. Which tardy proficience may be attributed to several causes: in particular, the making two labours of one, by learning first the Accedence, then the Grammar in Latin, e'er the language of those rules be understood. The only remedy of this, was to join both books into one, and in the English Tongue; whereby the long way is much abbreviated, and the labour of understanding much more easy: a work supposed not to have been done formerly; or if done, not without such difference here in brevity and alteration, as may be found of moment. That of Grammar, touching letters and syllables, is omitted, as learnt before, and little different from the English Spelling-book; especially since few will be persuaded to pronounce Latin otherwise than their own English. What will not come under rule, by reason of the much variety in declension, gender, or construction, is also here omitted, lest the course and clearness of method be clogged with catalogues instead of rules, or too much interruption between rule and rule: Which Linaker, setting down the various idioms of many verbs, was forced to do by Alphabet; and therefore though very learned, not thought fit to be read in schools. But in such words, a Dictionary stored with good authorities will be found the readiest guide. Of figurate construction, what is useful, is digested into several rules of Syntaxis: and Prosody, after this Grammar well learned, will not need to be Englished for him who hath a mind to read it. Account might be now given what addition or alteration from other Grammars hath been here made, and for what reason. But he who would be short in teaching, must not be long in pre-facing: The book itself follows, and will declare sufficiently to them who can discern.

ACCE-

A C C E D E N C E

COMMENCED

G R A M M A R.

LATIN Grammar is the art of right understanding, speaking, or writing Latin, observed from them who have spoken or written it best.

Grammar hath two parts: right-wording, usually called Etymology; and right-joining of words, or Syntaxis.

Etymology, or right-wording, teacheth what belongs to every single word or part of Speech.

Of LATIN SPEECH

Are eight General Parts:

Noun	De- clined.	Adverb	Unde- clined.
Pronoun		Conjunction	
Verb		Preposition	
Participle		Interjection	

DEclined are those words which have divers endings; as Homo a man, Hominis of a man; Amo I love, amas thou lovest. Undeclined are those words which have but one ending, as bene well, cum when, tum then.

Nouns, pronouns, and participles, are declined with gender, number, and case; verbs, as hereafter in the verb.

Of Genders.

Genders are three, the masculine, feminine, and neuter. The masculine may be declined with this article Hic, as hic Vir a man; the feminine with this Article, Hæc, as hæc Mulier a woman; the neuter with this article Hoc, as hoc Saxum a stone.

Of the masculine are generally all nouns belonging to the male kind, as also the names of rivers, months and winds.

Of the feminine, all nouns belonging to the female kind, as also the names of countries, cities, trees, some few of the two

latter excepted: Of cities, as Agragas and Sulmo, masculine; Argos, Tibur, Prænestæ, and such as end in um, neuter; Anxur both. Of trees, Oleaster and Spinus, Masculine; but Oleaster is read also feminine, Cic. verr. 4. Acer, filer, suber, thus, robur, Neuter.

And of the Neuter are all nouns, not being proper names, ending in um, and many others.

Some nouns are of two genders, as hic or hæc dies a day; and all such may be spoken both of male and female, as hic or hæc Parens a father or mother: some be of three, as hic hæc and hoc Felix happy.

Of Numbers.

Words declined have two numbers, the singular and the plural. The singular speaketh but of one, as Lapis a stone. The plural of more than one, as Lapides stones; yet sometimes but of one, as Athenæ the city Athens, Literæ an Epistle, ædes ædium a house.

Note that some nouns have no singular, and some no plural, as the nature of their signification requires. Some are of one gender in the singular; of another, or of two genders in the plural, as reading will best teach.

Of Cases.

Nouns, pronouns, and participles are declined with six endings, which are called cases, both in the singular and plural number. The nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative, and ablative.

The Nominative is the first case, and properly nameth the thing, as Liber a book.

The Genitive is englished with this sign of, as Libri of a book.

The

The Dative with this Sign to, or for, as Libro to or for a book.

The Accusative hath no Sign.

The Vocative calleth or speaketh to, as O Liber O book, and is commonly like the nominative.

But in the neuter gender the nominative, accusative, and vocative, are like in both numbers, and in the plural end always in a.

The Ablative is englished with these signs, in, with, of, for, from, by, and such like, as De Libro of or from the book, pro Libro for the book; and the ablative plural is always like the dative.

Note, that some nouns have but one ending throughout all cases, as Frugi, nequam, nihil; and all words of number from three to a hundred, as quatuor four, quinque five, &c.

Some have but one, some two, some three cases only, in the singular or plural, as use will best teach.

Of a Noun.

A Noun is the name of a thing, as Manus a hand, Domus a house, Bonus good, Pulcher fair.

Nouns be substantives or adjectives.

A noun substantive is understood by itself, as Homo a man, Domus a house.

An adjective, to be well understood, requireth a substantive to be joined with it, as Bonus good, parvus little, which cannot be well understood unless something good or little be either named, as bonus vir a good man, parvus puer a little boy; or by use understood, as honestum an honest thing, boni good men.

The Declining of Substantives.

Nouns substantives have five declensions or forms of ending their cases, chiefly distinguished by the different ending of their genitive singular.

The first Declension.

THE first is when the genitive and dative singular end in æ, &c. as in the example following.

VOL. I.

Singular.	Plural.
No. Voc. Abl. musa	Nom. Voc. musæ
Gen. Dat. musæ	Gen. musarum
Acc. musam	Dat. Abl. musis
	Acc. musas.

This one word familia joined with pater, mater, filius, or filia, endeth the genitive in as, as pater familias, but sometimes familiæ. Dea, mula, equa, liberta, make the dative and ablative plural in abus; filia and nata in is or abus.

The first declension endeth always in a, unless in some words derived of the Greek: and is always of the feminine gender, except in names attributed to men, according to the general rule, or to stars, as Cometa, Planeta.

Nouns, and especially proper names derived of the Greek, have here three endings, as, es, e, and are declined in some of their cases after the Greek form. Æneas, acc. Ænean, voc. Ænea; Anchises, acc. Anchisen, voc. Anchise or Anchisa, abl. Anchise. Penelope, Penelopes, Penelopen, voc. abl. Penelope. Sometimes following the Latin, as Marsya, Philocteta, for as and es; Philoctetam, Eriphylam, for an and en. Cic.

The second Declension.

THE second is when the genitive singular endeth in i, the Dative in o, &c.

Sing.	Plur.
Nom. Voc. Liber	Nom. Voc. Libri
Gen. libri	Gen. librorum
Dat. Abl. libro	Dat. Abl. libris
Acc. librum	Acc. libros.

Note that when the nominative endeth in us, the vocative shall end in e, as Dominus ô Domine, except Deus ô Deus. And these following, Agnus, lucus, vulgus, populus, chorus, fluvius, e or us.

When the nominative endeth in ius, if it be the proper name of a man, the vocative shall end in i, as Georgius ô Georgi; hereto add filius ô fili, and genius ô geni.

All nouns of the second declension are of the masculine or neuter gender, of the masculine, such as end in ir, or, or us, except

except some few, humus, domus, alvus, and others derived of the Greek, as methodus, antidotus, and the like, which are of the feminine, and some of them sometimes also masculine, as atomus, phaselus; to which add ficus the name of a disease, grossus, pampinus, and rubus.

Those of the neuter, except virus, pelagus, and vulgus (which last is sometimes masculine) end all in um, and are declined as followeth:

Sing.	Plur.
No. Ac. Vo. Studium	No. Ac. Voc. Studia
Gen. studii	Gen. studiorum
Dat. Abl. studio	Dat. Abl. studiis

Some nouns in this declension are of the first example singular, of the second plural, as Pergamus the city Troy, plur. hæc Pergama; and some names of hills, as Mænalus, Ismarus, hæc Ismara; so also Tartarus, and the lake Avernus; others are of both, as sibilus, jocus, locus, hi loci, or hæc loca. Some are of the second example singular, of the first plural, as Argos, Cœlum, plur. hi Cœli; others of both, as Rastrium, Capistrum, Filum, Frænum; plur. fræni or fræna. Nundinum, & Epulum, are of the first declension plural, Nundinæ, Epulæ; Balneum of both, balneæ or balnea.

Greek proper names have here three endings, os, on, and us long from a Greek diphthong. Hæc Delos, hanc Delon. Hoc Ilion. The rest regular, Hic panthus, ô panthu, Virg.

The third Declension.

THE third is when the genitive singular endeth in is, the dative in i, the accusative in em, the ablative in e, and sometimes in i; the Nom. Acc. Voc. plural in es, the Genitive in um, and sometimes in ium, &c.

Sing.	Plur.
No. Gen. Vo. Panis	Nom. Acc. Voc. panes
Dat. pani	Gen. panum
Acc. panem	Dat. Abl. panibus.
Abl. pane.	

Sing.	Plur.
Nom. Voc. Parens	No. Ac. Voc. parentes
Gen. parentis	Gen. parentum
Dat. parenti	Dat. Abl. parentibus.
Acc. parentem	
Abl. parente	

This third declension, with many endings, hath all genders, best known by dividing all nouns hereto belonging into such as either increase one syllable long or short in the genitive, or increase not at all.

Such as increase not in the genitive are generally feminine, as Nubes nubis, Caro carnis.

Except such as end in er, as hic venter ventris, and these in is following, natalis, aqualis, lienis, orbis, callis, caulis, collis, follis, mensis, ensis, fustis, funis, panis, penis, crinis, ignis, cassis, fascis, torris, piscis, unguis, vermis, vectis, postis, axis, and the Compounds of assis, as centussis.

But canalis, finis, clunis, restis, sentis, amnis, corbis, linter, torquis, anguis, hic or hæc: To these add vepres.

Such as end in e are neuters, as mare, rete, and two Greek in es, as hippomanes, cacoëthes.

Nouns encreasing long.

Nouns encreasing one syllable long in the genitive are generally feminine, as hæc pietas pietatis, virtus virtutis.

Except such as end in ans masculine, as dodrans, quadrans, sextans; in ens, as oriens, torrens, bidens, a pick-ax.

In or, most commonly derived of verbs, as pallor, clamor; in o, not thence derived, as ternio, senio, sermo, temo, and the like.

And these of one syllable, fal, fol, ren, splen, as, bes, pes, mos, flos, ros, dens, mons, pons, fons, grex.

And words derived from the Greek in en, as lichen; in er, as crater; in as, as adamas; in es, as lebes; to these, hydrops, thorax, phoenix.

But scrobs, rudens, stirps, the body or root of a tree, and calx a heel, hic or hæc.

Neuter,

Neuter, these of one syllable, mel, fel, lac, far, ver, cor, æs, vas vasis, os offis, os oris, rus, thus, jus, crus, pus. And of more syllables in al and ar, as capital, laquear, but halec hoc or hæc.

Nouns encreasing short.

Nouns encreasing short in the genitive are generally masculine, as hic sanguis sanguinis, lapis lapidis.

Except, Feminine all words of many syllables ending in do or go, as dulcedo, compago; arbor, hyems, cuspis, pecus pecudis: These in ex, forfex, carex, tomex, supellex: In ix, appendix, histrix, coxendix, filix; Greek nouns in as and is, as lampas, iaspis: To these add chlamis, bacchar, syndon, icon.

But margo, cinis, pulvis, adeps, forceps, pumex, ramex, imbrex, obex, filex, cortex, onyx and sardonix, hic or hæc.

Neuters are all ending in a, as problema; in en, except hic pecten; in ar, as jubar; in er these, verber, iter, uber, cadaver, zinziber, laser, cicer, fiser, piper, papaver; sometimes in ur, except hic furfur, in us, as onus, in ut, as caput; to these marmor, æquor, ador.

Greek proper names here end in as, an, is, and ens, and may be declined some wholly after the Greek form, as pallas, pallados, palladi, pallada; others in some cases, as Atlas, acc. atlanta, voc. atla. Garamas, plur. garamantes, acc. garamantas. Pan, panos, pana. Phyllis, phyllidos, voc. phylli, plur. Phyllides, acc. phyllidas. Tethys, tethyos, acc. tethyn, voc. tethy. Neapolis neapolios, acc. neapolin. Paris, paridos or parios, acc. parida or parin. Orpheus, orpheos, orphei, orphea, orpheu. But names in eus borrow sometimes their genitive of the second declension, as Erechtheus, erechthei. Cic. Achilles or Achilleus, Achillei; and sometimes their accusative in on or um, as Orpheus Orpheon, Theseus Theseum, Perseus Perseum, which sometimes is formed after Greek words of the first declension Latin, Perseus or Perses, Persæ Persæ Persen Persæ Persa.

The fourth Declension.

THE fourth is when the genitive singular endeth in us, the dative singular in ui, and sometimes in u, plural in ibus, and sometimes in ubus.

Sing.				Plur.		
No.	Ge.	Vo.	Sensus	No.	Ac.	Vo. sensus
	Dat.	Sensui			Gen.	sensuum
	Acc.	sensum			Dat.	Abl. sensibus
	Abl.	sensu.				

The fourth declension hath two endings, us and u; us generally masculine, except some few, as hæc manus, ficus, the fruit of a tree, acus, porticus, tribus, but penus and specus hic or hæc. U of the neuter, as gelu, genu, veru; but in the singular most part defective.

Proper names in os and o long, pertaining to the fourth declension Greek, may belong best to the fourth in Latin, as Androgeos, Gen. Androgeo, Ac. Androgeon; Hic Athos, hunc Atho, Virg. Hæc Sappho, Gen. Sapphus, Acc. Sappho. Better authors follow the Latin form, as Dido Didonis Didonem. But Jesus Jesu Jesum Jesu Jesu.

The fifth Declension.

THE fifth is when the Genitive and Dative singular end in ei, &c.

Sing.			Plur.		
Nom.	Voc.	Res	No.	Ac.	Voc. res
	Gen.	Dat. rei		Gen.	rerum
	Acc.	rem		Dat.	Abl. rebus.
	Abl.	re			

All nouns of the fifth declension are of the feminine gender, except dies hic or hæc, and his compound meridies hic only.

Some nouns are of more declensions than one, as vas vasis of the third in the Singular, of the second in the plural vasa vasorum. Colus, laurus, and some others, of the second and fourth. Saturnalia, saturnalium or saturnaliorum, saturnalibus, and such other names of feasts. Poëmata

poëmatum, poëmatis or poëmatibus, of the second and third plural. Plebs of the third and fifth, plebis or plebei.

The Declining of Adjectives.

A Noun adjective is declined with three terminations, or with three articles.

An adjective of three terminations is declined like the first and second declension of substantives joined together after this manner.

Sing.	Plur.
N. bonus bona bonum	No. Vo. boni bonæ
G. boni bonæ boni	bona
D. bono bonæ bono	G. bonorum bonarum
A. bonum bonam bonum	Dat. Abl. bonis
V. bone bona bonum	A. bonos bonas bona.
A. bono bona bono	

In like manner those in er and ur, as sacer sacra sacrum, fatur fatūra faturum; but unus, totus, solus, alius, alter, ullus, uter, with their compounds neuter, uterque, and the like, make their genitive singular in ius, the dative in i, as unus una unum, Gen. unius. Dat. uni, in all the rest like bonus, save that alius maketh in the neuter gender aliud, and in the Dative alii, and sometimes in the Genitive.

Ambo and duo be thus declined in the plural only.

Nom. Voc. Ambo ambæ ambo
Gen. amborum ambarum amborum.
Dat. Abl. ambobus ambabus ambobus
Ac. ambos or ambo, ambas ambo.

Adjectives of three Articles have in the Nominative either one ending, as hic, hæc, & hoc felix; or two, as hic & hæc tristis & hoc triste; and are declined like the third declension of Substantives, as followeth.

Sing.	Plur.
Nom. hic hæc & hoc	Nom. hi & hæ felices, & hæc felicia
Felix.	
Gen. felicitis	Gen. felicitum
Dat. felici	Dat. Abl. felicitibus
Acc. hunc & hanc felicem, & hoc felix.	Acc. hos & has felices & hæc felicia
Voc. ô felix.	Voc. ô felices, & ô felicia.
Abl. felice or felici	

Sing.	Plur.
No. hic & hæc tristis & hoc triste	Nom. hi & hæc tristes & hæc tristia
Gen. tristis	Gen. tristium
Dat. Abl. tristi	Dat. Abl. tristibus
Ac. hunc & hanc tristem, & hoc triste	Ac. hos & has tristes, & hæc tristia
Voc. ô tristis & ô triste	Voc. ô tristes, & ô tristia.

There be also another sort which have in the nominative case three terminations and three articles, as hic acer, hic & hæc acris, hoc acre. In like manner be declined equester, volucer, and some few others, being in all other cases like the examples foregoing.

Comparisons of Nouns.

Adjectives, whose signification may increase or be diminished, may form comparison, whereof there be two degrees above the positive word itself, The comparative, and superlative.

The positive signifieth the thing itself without comparing, as durus hard.

The comparative exceedeth his positive in signification, compared with some other, as durior harder; and is formed of the first case of his positive that endeth in t, by putting thereto or and us, as of duri, hic & hæc durior, & hoc durius: of dulci, dulcior, dulcius.

The superlative exceedeth his positive in the highest degree, as durissimus hardest; and it is formed of the first case of his positive that endeth in is, by putting thereto fimus, as of duris durissimus, dulcis dulcissimus.

If the positive end in er, the superlative is formed of the nominative case by putting to rimus, as pulcher pulcherrimus. Like to these are vetus veterrimus, maturus maturimus; but dexter dexterrimus, and sinister, sinisterior, sinisterrimus.

All these nouns ending in lis make the superlative by changing is into limus, as humilis, similis, facilis, gracilis, agilis, docilis docillimus.

All other nouns ending in lis do follow the general rule, as utilis utilissimus.

Of these positives following are formed a different sort of superlatives; of superus, supremus and summus; inferus, infimus and imus; exterus, extimus and extremus; posterus postremus.

Some of these want the positive, and are formed from Adverbs; of intra, interior, intimus, ultra ulterior ultimus, citra citior citimus, pridem prior primus, prope propior proximus.

Others from positives without case, as nequam, nequior, nequissimus.

Some also from no positive, as ocior ocissimus. Some want the comparative, as novus novissimus, inclytus inclytissimus.

Some the superlative, as senex senior, juvenis junior, adolescens adolescentior.

Some ending in us, frame their comparative as if they ended in ens, benevolus, maledicus, magnificus magnificentior magnificentissimus.

These following are without rule, bonus melior optimus, malus pejor pessimus, magnus major maximus, parvus minor minimus; multus plurimus, multa plurima, multum plus plurimum.

If a vowel come before us, it is compared with magis and maximè, as pius, magis pius, maximè pius; idoneus, magis and maximè idoneus. Yet some of these follow the general rule, as assiduus assiduissimus, strenuus strenuior, exiguus exiguius, tenuis tenuior tenuissimus.

Of a Pronoun.

A Pronoun is a part of speech that standeth for a noun substantive, either at present or before spoken of, as ille, he or that, hic this, qui who.

There be ten pronouns, Ego, tu, fui, ille, ipse, iste, hic, is, qui and quis, besides their compounds, egomet, tute, hicce, idem, quisnam aliquis, and such others. The rest so called, as meus, tuus, suus, noster, vester, nostras, vestras, cujus and cujas, are not pronouns, but adjectives thence derived.

Of Pronouns such as shew the thing present are called Demonstratives, as ego, tu, hic; and such as refer to a thing ante-

cedent, or spoken of before, are called relatives, as qui who or which.

Quis, and often qui, because they ask a question, are called Interrogatives, with their compounds, ecquis, numquis.

Declensions of Pronouns are three.

Ego, tu, fui, be of the first declension, and be thus declined.

Sing.	Plur.
Nom. Ego	Nom. Acc. Nos
Gen. mei	Ge. nostrum or nostri
Dat. mihi	Dat. Abl. nobis
Acc. Abl. me	Voc. caret.
Voc. caret.	

Sing.	Plur.
Nom. Voc. Tu	Nom. Acc. Voc. vos
Gen. tui	Ge. vestrum or vestri
Dat. tibi	Dat. Abl. vobis.
Acc. Abl. te	

Sing.	Nom. Voc. caret	Dat. sibi
Plur.	Gen. fui	Acc. Abl. se.

From these three be derived meus, tuus, suus, noster, vester, nostras, vestras, (which are called possessives) whereof the former five be declined like adjectives of three terminations, except that meus in the vocative case maketh mi, mea, meum; nostras, vestras, with three articles, as hic & hæc nostras, & hoc nostras or nostrate, vestrate. In other cases according to rule.

These three, ille, iste, ipse, be of the second declension, making their genitive singular in ius, their dative in i; and the former two be declined like the adjective alius, and the third like unus before spoken of.

Sing.	No. ille illa illud, Gen. illius, Dat. illi.
	No. iste ista istud, Gen. istius, Dat. isti.
	No. ipse ipsa ipsum, Gen. ipsius, Dat. ipsi.

These four, hic, is, qui and quis, be of the third declension, making their genitive singular in jus, with j consonant, and be declined after this manner.

Sing.

Sing.	Plur.
Nom. hic hæc hoc	Nom. hi hæc hæc
Gen. hujus	Gen. horum harum
Dat. huic	horum
Acc. hunc hanc hoc	Dat. Abl. his
Voc. caret.	Acc. hos has hæc.
Abl. hoc hac hoc	Voc. caret.

Of iste and hic is compounded istic, istæc, istoc or istuc. Acc. instunc, istanc, istoc or istuc. Abl. istoc, istac, istoc, plu. istæc only.

Sing.	Plur.
Nom. is ea id	Nom. ii eæ ea
Gen. ejus.	Gen. eorum earum
Dat. ei	eorum
Acc. eum eam id	Dat. Abl. iis or eis
Voc. caret.	Acc. eos eas ea
Abl. eo ea eo.	Voc. caret.

Sing.	Plur.
Nom. qui quæ quod	Nom. qui quæ quæ
Gen. cujus	Gen. quorum quarum
Dat. cui	quorum (queis
Acc. quem quam quod	Dat. Abl. quibus or
Voc. caret	Acc. quos quas quæ
Ab. quo qua quo or qui	Voc. caret.

In like manner, quivis, quilibet, and quicunque the Compounds.

Sing. Nom. quis, qua or quæ, quid, Gen. &c. like qui. So quisquam, quisnam, compounds.

Of Quis are made these pronoun adjectives, cujus-cujus-cujum, whose; and hic & hæc-cujus and hoc-cujate, of what nation.

Quisquis is defective, and thus declined,

No.	Quisquis	Ac.	Quicquid	Ab.	Quoquo
	Quicquid				Quaqua
					Quoquo

Of a Verb.

A Verb is a part of speech, that betokeneth being, as sum I am, or doing, as laudo I praise; and is declined with mood, tense, number and person.

Moods.

THere be four moods which express the manner of doing; the indicative, the imperative, the potential or subjunctive, and the infinitive.

The indicative mood sheweth or declar-eth, as laudo I praise.

The imperative biddeth or exhorteth, as lauda praise thou.

The potential or subjunctive is englished with these signs, may, can, might, would, could, should: Or without them as the indicative, if a conjunction go before or follow; as laudem, I may or can praise. Cum laudarem when I praised. Cavisssem, si prævidisssem, I had bewared if I had foreseen.

The infinitive is englished with this sign to, as laudare to praise.

Tenses.

THere be three tenses which express the time of doing: The present, the preterit or past, and the future.

The present tense speaketh of the time that now is, as laudo I praise.

The preterit speaketh of the time past, and is distinguished by three degrees: the preterimperfect, the preterperfect, and the preterpluperfect.

The preterimperfect speaketh of the time not perfectly past, as laudabam I praised or did praise.

The preterperfect speaketh of the time perfectly past, as laudavi I have praised.

The preterpluperfect speaketh of the time more than perfectly past, as laudaveram I had praised.

The future tense speaketh of the time to come, as laudabo I shall or will praise.

Persons.

THrough all moods, except the infinitive, there be three persons in both numbers, as, Sing. Laudo I praise, laudas thou praisest, laudat he praiseth; plur. Laudamus we praise, laudatis ye praise, laudent they praise. Except some verbs which are declined or formed in the third person

person only, and have before them this sign, it, as *tædit* it irketh, *oportet* it behoveth, and are called impersonals.

The verb which betokeneth being, is properly the verb *sum* only, which is therefore called a verb substantive, and formed after this manner.

Indicative.

Pref. | I am.
sing. | *Sum, es, est, Plur. sumus, estis, sunt.*
Pret. | I was.
imp. | *Eram, eras, erat, Pl. eramus, eratis, erant.*

I have been.

Pret. | *Fui, fuisti, fuit, Plur. fuimus, fuistis, fuerunt or fuere.*
perfect.

I had been.

Pret. | *Fueram, fueras, fuerat, Pl. fueramus, fueratis, fuerant.*
plup.

Fu- | I shall or will be.

ture | *Ero, eris, erit, Pl. erimus, eritis, erunt.*

Imperative.

Be thou,

Sing. | *Sis, es, Sit, esto. Plur. Sitis, este, Sint, estote. sunt.*

Potential.

Pref. | I may or can be.
sing. | *Sim, sis, sit, Pl. simus, sitis, sint.*

I might or could be.

Preter. | *Essem or forem, es, et, Pl. essemus, essetis, essent or forent.*
imperf.

Preter. | I might or could have been.

perfect. | *Fuerim, ris, rit, Pl. rimus, ritis, rint.*

Preterplup. | If I had been

with a conjunction Si | *Fuissem, es, et, Pl. emus, etis, ent.*

Future. | If I shall be, or shall have been.

Si | *Fuero, ris, rit, Pl. rimus, ritis, rint.*

Infinitive.

Pref. and preter-imperf. | *Esse, to be* | Preter-perfect, & pret. pluper. | *Fuisse, to have or had been.*

Future. | *Fore, to be hereafter.*

In like manner are formed the compounds; *Absum adsum, desum, obsum, præsum, profum, possum*; but *possum* something varies after this manner.

Indicat. Pres. Sing. *Possum, potes, potest, Plur. possumus, potestis, possunt.* The other are regular, *poteram, potui, potueram, potero.*

Imperative it wants.

Potent. Pres. *Possum, &c. Preterimperfect, Possim.*

Infin. Pres. *Posse. Preterit. Potuisse.*

Voices.

IN Verbs that betoken Doing are two voices, the Active and the Passive.

The Active signifieth to do, and always endeth in *o*, as *doceo* I teach.

The Passive signifieth what is done to one by another, and always endeth in *or*, as *doceor* I am taught.

From these are to be excepted two sorts of verbs. The first are called Neuters, and cannot take *or* in the passive, as *curro* I run, *sedeo* I sit; yet signify sometimes passively, as *vapulo* I am beaten.

The second are called Deponents, and signify actively, as *loquor* I speak; or neuters, as *glorior* I boast: but are formed like passives.

Conjugations.

VERBS both Active and Passive have four conjugations, or forms of declining, known and distinguished by their infinitive mood active, which always endeth in *re*.

In the first conjugation, after a long, as *laudare* to praise.

In the second, after *e* long, as *habere* to have.

In the third, after *e* short, as *legere* to read.

In the fourth, after *i* long, as *audire* to hear.

In these four conjugations, verbs are declined or formed by mood, tense, number and person, after these examples.

Indi-

Indicative Mood.

Present Tense,

Singular.

Plural.

I	Thou	He	We	Ye	They
praise.	praest.	praesth.	praise.	praise.	praise.
Laudo,	laudas,	laudat,	laudamus,	laudatis,	laudent.
Habeo,	habes,	habet,	habemus,	habetis,	habent.
Lego,	legis,	legit,	legimus,	legitis,	legunt.
Audio,	audis,	audit,	audimus,	auditis,	audiunt.

Preter-	Laudabam,	I praised, or did praise.
imperfect	Habebam,	
tense sing.	Legebam,	bas, bat, Pl. bamus,
	Audiebam,	batis, bant.

Preter.	Laudavi	I have praised.
perfect	Habui	
tense sing.	Legi	isti, it, Plur. imus, istis,
	Audivi	erunt or ere

Preter-	Laudaveram	I had praised.
pluperfect	Habueram	
tense sing.	Legeram	ras, rat, Pl. ramus,
	Audiveram	ratis, rant.

Future	Laudabo	bis, bit, Plur. bimus,
tense sing.	Habebo	bitis, bunt.
	Legam	es, et, Plur. emus, eris,
	Audiam	ent.

Imperative Mood.

Praise	Let him	Let us	Praise	Let them
thou	praise.	praise	ye	praise.
Lauda,	laudet	Pl. lau-	Laudate,	laudent,
laudato	laudato	demus	laudatote.	laudanto.
Habe,	Habeat.	Pl. habe-	Habete, Habeant,	
habeto.	habeto.	amus,	habetote.	habento.
Legi,	Legat	Pl. Lega-	Legite, Legant.	
legito.	legito	mus.	legitote.	legunto.
Audi,	Audiat	Pl. audi-	Audite, Audiant,	
audito,	audito.	amus.	audito.	audiunto.

Potential Mood.

Present	Laudem, laudes, laudet,	Pl. laudemus,
tense sing.	Habeam,	laudetis, laudent.
	Legam,	as, at, Pl. amus, atis, ant.
	Audiam,	

Preterim-	Laudarem,	I might or could praise.
perfect	Haberem,	
tense sing.	Legerem,	res, ret, Plur. remus,
	Audirem,	retis, rent.

I might or could have praised.

Preter-	Laudaverim,	
perfect	Habuerim	
tense sing.	Legerim	ris, rit, Plur. rimus, ritis,
	Audiverim,	rint.

If I had praised.

Preterplu.	Laudavisset,	
sing. with	Habuissem,	ses, set, Plur. semus,
a Coniunc-	Legissem,	setis, sent.
tion, Si	Audivisset,	

If I shall praise, or shall have praised.

Future	Laudavero,	
tense sing.	Habero,	ris, rit. Plur. rimus, rit-
	Legero,	tis, rint.
	Audivero,	

Infinitive Mood.

Present	Laudare	
and Pre-	Habere,	
terimper-	Legere	
fect tense.	Audire,	

Preterper-	Laudavisse,	
fect & Pre-	Habuisse,	
terpluper-	Legisse,	
fect tense.	Audivisse,	

Verbs of the third Conjugation irregular in some Tenses of the Active Voice.

Indicative Mood.

Present Tense singular.

Volo, vis, vult,	Volumus, vultis, volunt.
Nolo, ———	Nolumus ——— nolunt.
The rest is want	ing in this Tense.
Malo, mavis, mavult	Malumus, mavultis, malunt.

Preterit.	Volui
	Nolui.
	Malui.

Volo and Malo want the Imperative Mood.

Imperative.

Sing.	{ Noli,	{ Plur.	{ Nolite,
	{ Nolito.		{ Nolitote.

Potential.

Present	Velim,	
tense sing.	Nolim,	is, it, Pl. imus, itis, int.
	Malim,	

Preter-

Preterim- Vellem, }
perfect Nollem, } es, et, Pl. emus, etis, ent.
tense sing. Mallem, }

Infinitive.

Present. { Velle,
Nolle,
Malle.

Indicat. Pres. Edo, edis, or es, edit or est; Plur. Editis, or estis.

Imper. Ede or es, edito or esto. Edat, edito or esto. Plur. Edite este, editote estote.

Poten. Preterimperfect Tense, Ederem or esset.

Infinit. Edere or esse.

Verbs of the fourth Conjugation irregular, in some Tenses Active.

EO, and queo with his compound Ne-queo, make eunt and queunt in the plural indicative present, and in their preterimperfect ibam and quibam, their future; ibo and quibo.

Imperat. I, ito. Eat, ito. Plur. Eamus, ite, itote. Eant, eunto.

Potent. Eam, Irem, &c.

The forming of the Passive Voice.

Indicative.

I am praised.

Pres. Sing.	Laudor, aris or are, atur,	Plur.	amur, amini, antur.
	Habeor, eris or ere, etur,		emur, emini, entur.
	Legor, eris or ere, itur,		imur, imini, untur.
	Audior, iris or ire, itur,		imur, imini, iuntur.

I was praised.

Preterim- perfect tense sing.	Laudabar,	}	baris or bare, batur, Plur. bamur, bamini, bantur,
	Habebar,		
	Legebar,		
	Audiebar,		

Note that the Passive Voice hath no Preterperfect, nor the Tenses derived from thence in any Mood.

I shall or will be praised.

Future tense sing.	Laudabor,	}	beris or bere, bitur, Plur. bimur, bimini, buntur, eris or ere, etur, Pl. emur, emini, entur.
	Habebor,		
	Legar,		
	Audiar,		

VOL. I.

Imperative.

Be thou Let him be Let us be Be ye Let them be
praised. praised. praised. praised. praised.

Laudare, laudetur, Pl. lau- laudamini, laudentur,
laudator. laudator. demur. laudaminor, laudan-
[tor.

Habere, habeatur, Pl. habe- habemini, habeantur.
habetor. habetor. amur. habeminor, habentor.

Legere, legatur, Pl. lega- legimini, legantur,
legitor. legitor. mur. legiminor. leguntur.

Audire, audiat, Pl. audi- audimini, audiantur.
auditor. auditor. amur. audiminor. audiuntor.

Potential.

I may or can be praised.

Present sing.	Lauder, eris or ere, etur, Plur. emur,	}	aris or are, atur, Plur. amur, amini, antur.
	Habeat,		
	Legat,		
	Audiat,		

I might or should be praised.

Preterim- perfect sing.	Laudarer,	}	reris or rere, retur. Plur. remur, remini, rentur.
	Haberer,		
	Legerer,		
	Audirer,		

Infinitive.

Present & Laudari Preterim- perfect.	Haberi	}	To be	}	Praised. Had. Read. Heard.
	Legi				
	Audiri				

Verbs irregular in some Tenses Passive.

EDor, editor, or estur: The rest is regular.

The verb Fio, is partly of the third, and partly of the fourth conjugation, and hath only the infinitive of the passive form.

Indicat. Pres. Sing. Fio, fis, fit, Plur. fimus, fitis, fiunt. Preterimperfect, Fiebam. Preterperfect it wants. Future Fiam, &c.

Imperat. Fi, fito. Plur. fite, fitote, fiant, fiunto.

Poten. Pres. Fiam, &c. Preterimperfect. Fierem.

Infinit. Fieri.

Also this verb Fero, is contracted or shortened in some tenses, both active and passive, as Fers, fert, for feris, ferit, &c.

4 R

Indicat.

Indicat. Pres. Sing. Fero, fers, fert. plu.
—fertis—Preterperfect. Tuli.

Imperat. Fer ferto, &c. pl. Ferte fertote.

Potent. Preterimperfect, Ferrem, &c.
Infinit. Ferre.

Passive.

Indic. Pres. Sing. Feror ferris or ferre, fertur, &c.

Imperat. Sing. Ferre, fertor, &c.

Potent. Preterimperfect, Ferror.

Infinit. Ferri.

Of Gerunds and Supines.

THere be also belonging to the infinitive mood of all verbs certain voices called gerunds and supines both of the active and passive signification.

The first gerund in di, as Laudandi of praising or of being praised. The second in do, as Laudando in praising or in being praised. The third in dum, as Laudandum to praise or to be praised.

Note that in the two latter conjugations, the gerunds end sometimes in undi, do, dum, as dicendi or dicundi: But from Eo always eundi, except in the compound ambiendi.

Supines are two. The first signifieth Actively, as laudatum to praise; the latter passively, as laudatu to be praised. Note that most neuters of the second conjugation, and volo, nolo, malo, with many other verbs, have no supine.

Verbs of the four conjugations irregular in the preterperfect tense or supines.

Verbs of the first conjugation form their preterperfect tense in avi, supine in atum, as Laudo laudavi laudatum.

Except

Poto potavi potatum or potum; neco necavi necatum or nectum.

Domo, tono, sono, crepo, veto, cubo, form ui, itum, as cubui cubitum; but secui sectum, fricui frictum, mico micui: yet some of these are found regular in the preterperfect tense or supine, especially compounded, as increpavit, discrepavit, di-

micavit, sonatum, dimicatum, intonatum, infricatum, and the like.

Plico and his compounds form ui or avi, as explicui explicavi, explicitum or explicatum; except supplico, and such as are compounded with a noun, as duplico multiplico in avi only.

But Lavo lavi lautum lotum or lavatum, juvo juvi, adjuvo adjuvi adjutum.

Do dedi datum, Sto, steti statum, in the compounds, stiti, stitum and sometimes statum, as Præsto præstiti præstitum and præstatum.

Verbs of the second conjugation form their preterperfect tense in ui, their supine in itum, as habeo habui habitum.

Some are regular in their preterperfect tense, but not in their supines, as doceo docui doctum, misceo miscui mistum, teneo tenui tentum, torreo torrui tostum, censeo censui censum, pateo patui passum, careo carui cassum and caritum.

Others are irregular both in preterperfect tense and supines, as jubeo jussi jussum, sorbeo sorbui sorpsi sorptum, mulceo mulsi mulsum, luceo luxi.

Deo in di, as sedeo sedi sessum, video vidi visum, prandeo prandi pransum. And some in si, as suadeo suasi suasum, rideo risi risum, ardeo arsi arsum. Four double their first letters, as Pendeo pependi pensum, mordeo momordi morsum, spondeo spondi sponsum, tondeo totondi tonsum; but not in their compounds, as dependi dependum.

Geo in si, and some in xi, as urgeo urxi, mulgeo mulsi mulxi mulctum, augeo auxi auctum, indulgeo indulsi indultum, frigeo frixi, lugeo luxi.

Leo leo and neo, nevi, vieo vievi vietum: But cieo cievi citum, deleo deleui deletum, fleo flevi fletum, compleo complevi completum; as also the compounds of oleo, except redoleo and suboleo; but adolevi adultum, neo nevi netum, but maneo mansi, torqueo torxi tortum, hæreo hæsi.

Veo in vi, as ferveo fervi, but deferreo deferbui, conniveo connivi and connixi, movi motum, voti votum, cavi cautum, favi fautum.

The

THE third conjugation formeth the preterperfect tense, by changing O of the present tense into I: the supine without certain rule, as *lego legi lectum*, *bibo bibi bibitum*, *lambo lambi*, *scabo scabi*, *ico ici ictum*, *mando mandi mansum*, *pando pandi passum*, *edo edi esum* or *estum*, in like manner *comedo*, the other compounds *esum* only; *rudo rudi*, *sallo falli falsum*, *psallo psalli*, *emo, emi emptum*, *viso visi visum*, *verto verti versum*, *solvo solvi solutum*, *volvo volvi volutum*, *exuo exui exutum*, but *ruo rui ruitum*, in compound *rutum*, as *derui derutum*; *ingruo, metuo metui*.

Others are irregular both in preterperfect tense and supine.

In *bo, scribo scripsi scriptum*, *nubo nupsi nuptum*, *cumbo cubui cubitum*.

In *co, vinco vici victum*, *dico dixi dictum*; in like manner *duco, parco peperci* and *parsi parsum* and *parcitum*.

In *do*, these three lose *n*, *findo, fidi fissum*, *scindo scidi scissum*, *fundo fudi fusum*. These following, *vado, rado, lædo, ludo, divido, trudo, claudio, plaudo, rodo, si* and *sum*, as *rosi rosum*, but *cedo cessi cessum*. The rest double their first letter in the preterperfect tense, but not compounded, as *tundo tutudi tunsum*, *contundo contudi contusum*, and so in other compounds. *Pendo pependi pensum*, *dependo dependi, tendo tetendi tensum* and *tentum*, *contendo, contendi pendo pepedi peditum*, *cado cecidi casum*, *occido, recido recidi recasum*. The other compounds have no supine. *Cædo cecidi cæsum*, *occido occidi occisum*. To these add all the compounds of *do* in this conjugation, *addo, credo, edo, dedo, reddo, perdo, abdo, obdo, condo, indo, trado, prodo, vendo vendidi venditum*, except the double compound, *obscondo obscondi*.

In *go, ago egi actum*, *dego degi, satego sategi, frango fregi fractum*, *pango* to join *pegi pactum*, *pango* to sing *panxi, ango anxii, jungo junxi junctum*; but these five, *fungo mingo pingo stringo ringo* lose *n* in their supines, as *finxi fictum, ningo, ninxi, figo fixi fixum, rego rexi rectum*; *diligo, negligo, intelligo, lexi lectum, spargo sparsi sparsum*. These double their first letter, *tango tetigi tactum*, but not in

his compounds, as *contingo contigi, pargo* to bargain *pepigi pactum*, *pungo* and *repungo* *pupugi* and *punxi punctum*, the other compounds *punxi* only.

Ho in *xi, traho traxi tractum, veho vexi vectum*.

In *lo, vello velli* and *vulsi vulsum, colui cultum*; *excello, præcello, cellui cellum*; *alo alui alitum altum*. The rest, not compounded, double their first letter, *Fallo fefelli falsum, refello refelli, pello pepuli pulsum, compello compuli, cello ceculi, percello perculi perculsum*.

In *mo, vomo vomui vomitum, tremo tremui, premo pressi pressum, como, premo, demo, fumo*, after the same manner, as *sumpsi, sumptum*.

In *No, sino sivi situm, sterno stravi stratum, sperno spreui spretum, lino, levi lini* and *livi litum, cerno crevi cretum, temno tempsti, contemno contempsti contemptum, gigno genui genitum, pono positum, cano cecini cantum, concino concinuo concentum*.

In *Po, rumpo rupi ruptum, scalpo scalpsi scalptum*; the rest in *ui, strepo strepui strepitum*.

In *quo, linquo liqui, relinquo reliqui relictum, coquo coxi coctum*.

In *ro, verro verri* and *versti versum, sero* to sow *sevi satum*, in compound, *situm*, as *insero insitum*; *sero* of another signification most used in his compounds, *Afferro, conferro, deserro, exero, serui, fertum, uro ussi ustum, gero gessi gestum, quæro quæsi quæsitum, tero trivi tritum, curro excurro, præcurro, cucurri cursum*, the other compounds double not, as *concurro concurrere*.

In *so, accerso, arcesso, incesso, lacecco, ivi itum, capecco both i and ivi, pinso pinsui pistum* and *pinsitum*.

In *sco, pasco pavi pastum; compesco, dispesco, ui; posco poposci, disco didici, quinisco quæxi, nosco novi notum*, but *agnosco agnitum, cognosco cognitum*.

In *to, sisto stiti statum, flecto flexi flexum, pecto pexui pexi pexum* and *pectitum, necto nexui nexi nexum, plecto plexi plexum, sterto stertui, meto messui messum, mitto misi missum, peto petivi petitum*.

In *vo, vivo vixi victum*.

In xo, texo texui textum, nexo nexui nexum.

In cio, facio feci factum, jacio jeci jactum, lacio lexi lectum, specio spexi spectum, with their compounds, but elicio elicui elicium.

In dio, fodio fodi fossum.

In gio, fugio fugi fugitum.

In pio, capio cepi captum, rapio rapui raptum, cupio cupivi cupitum, sapio sapui sapivi sapitum.

In rio, pario peperi partum.

In tio, quatio quassi quassum, concutio concussi concussum.

In uo, pluo plui pluvi plutum, struo struxi structum, fluo fluxi fluxum.

THE fourth conjugation formeth the preterperfect tense in ivi, the supine in itum.

Except, Venio veni ventum, comperio, reperio reperi repertum, cambio, campsi campsum, sepio sepsi septum, farcio farci fartum, fulceo fulsi fultum, sentio sensi sensum, haurio hausi haustum, fancio fanxi sanctum fancitum, vincio vinxi vinctum, salio salui saltum, in compound sultum, as defilio defilui defultum, amicio amicui amictum, aperio, operio perui pertum, veneo venivi venum, singultivi singultum, sepelivi sepultum.

Of Verbs Compounded.

THese Verbs compounded change a into e throughout, Damno, lacto, sacro, fallo, arceo, tracto, partio, farcio, carpo, patro, scando, spargo, as conspergo conspersi conspersum.

These following change their first vowel into i, and some of them their supines into e, habeo, lateo, salio, statuo, cado, lædo, cano, quæro, cædo, tango, egeo, teneo, taceo, sapio, rapio, placeo, displiceo, displicui displicitum; except, complaceo perplaceo posthabeo.

Scalpo, calco, salto, change a into u, as exculpo; claudio quatio lavo lose a, as excludo, excutio, eluo.

These following change their first vowel into i, but not in the preterperfect tense, and sometimes a into e in the supine, emo, sedeo, rego, frango, capio, jacio, lacio, spe-

cio, premo, as comprimo compressi compressum, conjicio conjeci conjectum, pango in two only, compingo, impingo: Ago, in all but perago, satago, circumago, dego and cogo coegi: Facio with a preposition only, not in other compounds, as inficio, olfacio: Lego in these only, diligo, eligo, intelligo, negligo, seligo, in the rest not, as prælego, add to these supersedeo.

Of Verbs Defective.

VERBS called Inceptives ending in sco, borrow their preterperfect tense from the verb whereof they are derived, as tepesco tepui from tepeo, ingemisco ingemui from ingemo; as also these verbs, cerno to see, vidi from video, sideo sedi from sedeo, fero tuli from tulo out of use, in the supine latum, tollo sustuli sublatum from suffero.

These want the preterperfect tense.

Verbs ending in asco, as puerasco; in isco, as fatisco; in urio, except parturio, esurio: these also, vergo, ambigo, ferio, furo, polleo, nideo, have no preterperfect tense.

Contrary, these four, Odi, coepi, novi memini, are found in the preterperfect tense only, and the tenses derived, as odi, oderam, oderim, odisse, except memini, which hath memento mementote in the imperative.

Others are defective both in tense and person, as Aio, ais, ait, Plur. aiunt. The preterimperfect aiebam is intire. Imperative, ai. Potential, aias, aiat. Plur. aiamus, aiant.

Ausim, for ausus sim, ausis, ausit, Plur. ausint.

Salveo, salvebis, salve salvetote, salvete salvetote, salvere.

Ave aveto, avete avetote.

Faxo, faxis, faxit, faxint.

Quæso, Plur. quæsumus.

Infit, infunt.

Inquio or inquam, inquis inquit, Plur. inquiunt. Inquiebat, Cic. Topic. inquisti, inquit. Future, inquires, inquiet, Imperat. Inque inquito. Potent. Inquiat.

Dor the first person passive of do, and and for before farris or farre in the indicative, are not read, nor der or fer in the potential.

Of

Of a Participle.

A Participle is a part of speech, partaking with the verb from whence it is derived in voice, tense, and signification, and with a noun adjective in manner of declining.

Participles are either of the active or passive voice.

Of the active two. One of the present tense ending in *ans*, or *ens*, as *laudans* praising, *habens*, *legens*, *audiens*, and is declined like *foelix*, as *hic hæc & hoc habens*, Gen. *habentis*, Dat. *habenti*, &c. *Docens docentis*, &c. But from *eo*, *euns*, and in the compounds *iens euntis*, except *ambiens ambientis*. Note that some verbs otherwise defective, have this participle, as *aiens*, *inquiens*.

The other of the future tense is most commonly formed of the first supine, by changing *m* into *rus*, as of *laudatum* *laudaturus* to praise or about to praise, *habiturus*, *lecturus*, *auditurus*; but some are not regularly formed, as of *sectum* *secaturus*, of *jutum* *juvaturus*, *sonitum* *soniturus*, *partum* *pariturus*, *argutum* *arguiturus*, and such like; of *sum*, *futurus*: This, as also the other two participles following are declined like *bonus*.

This participle, with the verb *Sum*, affordeth a second future in the active voice, as *laudaturus sum*, *es*, *est*, &c. as also the future of the infinitive, as *laudaturum esse* to praise hereafter, *futurum esse*, &c.

Participles of the passive voice are also two, one of the preterperfect tense, another of the future.

A participle of the preterperfect tense, is formed of the latter supine, by putting thereto *s*, as of *laudatu* *laudatus* praised, of *habitu* *habitus*, *lectu* *lectus*, *auditu* *auditus*.

This participle joined with the verb *Sum*, supplieth the want of a preterperfect and preterpluperfect tense in the indicative mood passive, and both them and the future of the potential; as also the preterperfect and preterpluperfect of the infinitive, and with *ire* or *fore* the future; as *laudatus sum* or *fui* I have been praised, Plur. *laudati sumus*

or *fuius* we have been praised, *laudatus eram* or *fueram*, &c. Potential, *laudatus sum* or *fuerim*, *laudatus essem* or *fuissem*, *laudatus ero* or *fuero*. Infinit. *laudatum esse* or *fuisse* to have or had been praised; *laudatum ire* or *fore* to be praised hereafter.

Nor only passives, but some actives also or neuters, besides their own preterperfect tense borrow another from this participle; *Coeno coenavi* and *coenatus sum*, *Juravi* and *juratus*, *Potavi* and *potus sum*, *Titubavi* and *titubatus*, *Careo carui cassus sum*, *Prandeo prandi* and *pransus*, *Pateo patui* and *passus sum*, *Placeo placui placitus*, *Sufesco suevi fuetus sum*, *Libet libuit* and *libitum est*, *Licet licuit licitum*, *Pudet puduit puditum*, *Piget piguit pigitum*, *Tædet tæduit pertæsum est*, and this deponent *Mereor merui* and *meritus sum*.

These neuters following, like passives, have no other preterperfect tense, but by this participle, *Gaudeo gavissus sum*, *fido fissus*, *audeo ausus*, *fio*, *factus*, *soleo solitus sum*.

These deponents also form this participle from supines irregular; *Labor lapsus*, *pattior passus*, *perpetior perpeffus*, *fateor fassus*, *confiteor*, *diffiteor diffessus*, *gradior gressus*, *ingredior ingressus*, *fatiscor fessus*, *metior mensus*, *utor usus*, *ordior* to spin *orditus*, to begin *orsus*, *nitor nissus* and *nixus*, *ulciscor ultus*, *irascor iratus*, *reor ratus*, *obliviscor oblitus*, *frutor fructus* or *fruitus*, *misereor misertus*, *tuor* and *tueor tuitus*, *loquor locutus*, *sequor secutus*, *experior expertus*, *paciscor pactus* *nanciscor*, *nactus*, *apiscor aptus*, *adipiscor adeptus*, *queror questus*, *proficiscor profectus*, *expergiscor experrectus*, *comminiscor commentus*, *nascor natus*, *moriator mortuus*, *orior ortus sum*.

A participle of the future passive is formed of the gerund in *dum*, by changing *m* into *s*, as of *laudandum* *laudandus* to be praised, of *habendum* *habendus*, &c. And likewise of this participle with the verb *Sum*, may be formed the same tenses in the passive, which were formed with the participle of the preterperfect tenses, as *laudandus sum* or *fui*, &c.

Infinit. *Laudandum esse* or *fore*.

Of verbs deponent come participles both of the active and passive form, as loquor loquens locutus locuturus loquendus; where of the participle of the preter tense signifieth sometimes both actively and passively, as dignatus, testatus, meditatus, and the like.

Of an Adverb.

AN Adverb is a part of speech joined with some other to explain its signification, as valdè probus very honest, benè est it is well, valdè doctus very learned, benè mane early in the morning.

Of adverbs, some be of Time, as hodie to day, cras to-morrow, &c.

Some be of Place, as Ubi where, ibi there, &c. And of many other forts needs to be here set down.

Certain adverbs also are compared, as Doctè learnedly, doctiùs doctissimè, fortiter fortissimè, sæpe sæpiùs sæpissimè, and the like.

Of a Conjunction.

A Conjunction is a part of speech that joineth words and sentences together.

Of Conjunctions some be copulatives, as & and, quoque also, nec neither.

Some be disjunctive, as aut or.

Some be casual, as nam for, quia because, and many such like.

Adverbs when they govern mood and tense, and join sentences together, as cum, ubi, postquam, and the like, are rather to be called conjunctions.

Of a Preposition.

A Preposition is a part of speech most commonly, either set before nouns in apposition, as ad patrem, or joined with

any other words in composition, as indoctus.

These six, di, dis, re, se, am, con, are not read but in composition.

As adverbs having cases after them, may be called prepositions, so prepositions having none, may be counted adverbs.

Of an Interjection.

AN Interjection is a part of speech, expressing some passion of the mind.

Some be of sorrow, as heu, hei.

Some be of marvelling, as papæ.

Some of disdaining, as vah.

Some of praising, as euge.

Some of exclaiming, as ô, proh, and such like.

Figures of Speech.

Words are sometimes encreased or diminished by a letter or syllable in the beginning, middle or ending, which are called Figures of speech.

Encreased

In the beginning, as Gnatus for natus, tetuli for tuli. Prothesis.

In the middle, as Rettulit for Retulit, Cinctus for Cinctus. Epenthesis.

In the end, as Dicier for dici. Paragoge.

Diminished

In the beginning, as Ruit for Eruit. Apherisis.

In the middle, as Audiit for audivit, dixti for dixisti, lamna for lamina. Syncope.

In the end, as Confili for confilii; scin for scisne. Apocope.

The

The Second Part of Grammar, commonly called Syntax, or Construction.

Hitherto the eight parts of speech declined and undeclined have been spoken of single, and each one by itself: Now followeth Syntax or Construction, which is the right joining of these parts together in a sentence.

Construction consisteth either in the agreement of words together in number, gender, case and person, which is called concord; or the governing of one the other in such case or mood as is to follow.

Of the Concords.

THERE be Three concords or agreements.

The first is of the adjective with his substantive.

The second is of the verb with his nominative case.

The third is of the relative with his antecedent.

An adjective (under which is comprehended both pronoun and participle) with his substantive or substantives, a verb with his nominative case or cases, and a relative with his antecedent or antecedents, agree all in number, and the two latter in person also: as *Amicus certus. Viri docti. Præceptor prælegit, vos vero negligitis. Xenophon & Plato fuere æquales. Vir sapit qui pauca loquitur. Pater & præceptor veniunt. Yea though the conjunction be disjunctive, as Quos neque desidia neque luxuria vitiaverant. Celsus. Pater & præceptor, quos quæritis. But if a verb singular follow many nominatives, it must be applied to each of them apart, as *Nisi foro & curiæ officium ac verecundia sua constiterit. Val. Max.**

An adjective with his substantive, and a relative with his antecedent agree in gender and case; but the relative not in case always, being oft-times governed by other constructions: as *Amicus certus in re incerta cernitur. Liber quem dedisti mihi.*

And if it be a participle serving the infinitive mood future, it oft-times agrees

not with the substantive neither in gender nor in number, as *Hanc sibi rem præsidio sperat futurum. Cic. Audierat non datum ire filio uxorem. Terent. Omnia potius actum iri puto quam de provinciis. Cic.*

But when a verb cometh between two nominative cases not of the same number, or a relative between two substantives not of the same gender, the verb in number, and the relative in gender may agree with either of them; as *Amantium iræ amoris reintegratio est. Quid enim nisi vota supersunt. Tuentur illum globum qui terra dicitur. Animal plenum rationis, quem vocamus hominem. Lutetia est quam nos Parisios dicimus.*

And if the nominative cases be of several persons, or the substantives and antecedents of several genders, the verb shall agree with the second person before the third, and with the first before either; and so shall the adjective or relative in their gender; as *Ego & tu sumus in tuto. Tu & pater periclitamini. Pater & mater mortui sunt. Frater & soror quos vidisti.*

But in things that have not life, an adjective or relative of the neuter gender, may agree with substantives or antecedents, masculine or feminine, or both together; as *Arcus & calami sunt bona. Arcus & calami quæ fregisti. Pulcritudinem, constantiam, ordinem in consiliis factisque conservanda putat. Cic. Off. 1. Ira & ægritudo permixta sunt. Sal.*

Note that the infinitive mood; or any part of a sentence may be instead of a nominative case to the verb, or of a substantive to the adjective, or of an antecedent to the relative, and then the adjective or relative shall be of the neuter gender: And if there be more parts of a sentence than one, the verb shall be in the plural number; *Diluculo surgere saluberrimum est. Virtutem sequi, vita est honestissima. Audito proconsulem in Ciliciam tendere. In tempore veni, quod omnium rerum est primum. Tu multum dormis & sæpe potas, quæ duo sunt corpori inimica.*

Some-

Sometimes also an adverb is put for the nominative case to a verb, and for a substantive to an adjective; as *Partim signorum sunt combusta*. *Prope centies & vicies erogatum est*. Cic. verr. 4.

Sometimes also agreement, whether it be in gender or number, is grounded on the sense, not on the words; as *Illum senium* for *illum senem*. *Iste scelus* for *iste scelestus*. Ter. *Transtulit in Eunuchum suam*, meaning *Comœdiam*. Ter. *Pars magna obligati*, meaning *homines*. Liv. *Impliciti laqueis nudus uterque* for *ambo*. Ov. *Alter in alterius jactantes lumina vultus*. Ovid. that is, *Alter & alter*. *Inspicienti ipsa refert te nobis*, for *mihi*. Catul. *Disce omnes*. Virg. *Æn.* 2. for *tu quisquis es*. *Dua importuna prodigia, quos egestas tribuno plebis constrictos addixerat*. Cic. pro Sest. *Pars merfi tenuere ratem*. Rhemus cum fratre Quirino jura dabant. Virg. that is, *Rhemus & frater Quirinus*. *Divellimur inde Iphitus & Pelias mecum*. Virg.

Construction of Substantives.

Hitherto of concord or agreement; the other part followeth, which is Governing, whereby one part of speech is governed by another, that is to say, is put in such case or mood as the word that governeth or goeth before in construction requireth.

When two substantives come together, betokening divers things, whereof the former may be an adjective in the neuter gender taken for a substantive, the latter (which also may be a pronoun) shall be in the genitive case; as *Facundia Ciceronis*. *Amator studiorum*. *Ferimur per opaca locorum*. *Corruptus vanis rerum*. Hor. *Desiderium tui*. *Pater ejus*.

Sometimes the former substantive, as this word *officium* or *mos*, is understood; as *Oratoris est*, it is the part of an orator. *Extremæ est dementiæ*, it is the manner of extream madness. *Ignavi est*, it is the quality of a slothful man. *Ubi ad Dianæ veneris*; *templum* is understood. *Justitiæne prius mirer belline laborum*. Virg. understand *causâ*. *Neque ille seposui Cice-*

ris, neque longæ invidit avenæ. Hor. Supply *partem*.

But if both the substantives be spoken of one thing, which is called apposition, they shall be both of the same case; as *Pater meus vir, amat me puerum*.

Words that signify quality, following the substantive whereof they are spoken, may be put in the genitive or ablative case; as *Puer bonæ indolis*, or *bona indole*. Some have a genitive only; as *Ingentis rex nominis*. Liv. *Decem annorum puer*. *Hujusmodi pax*. *Hujus generis animal*. But genus is sometimes in the accusative: as *Si hoc genus rebus non proficitur*. Varr. *de re rust*. And the cause or manner of a thing in the ablative only; as *Sum tibi natura parens, præceptor consiliis*.

Opus and *Ufus* when they signify need, require an ablative; as *Opus est mihi tuo judicio*. *Viginti minis usus est filio*. But *opus* is sometimes taken for an adjective undeclined, and signifieth needful: as *Dux nobis & author opus est*. *Alia quæ opus sunt para*.

Construction of Adjectives, governing a Genitive.

Adjectives that signify desire, knowledge, ignorance, remembrance, forgetfulness, and such like; as also certain others derived from verbs, and ending in *ax*, require a genitive; as *Cupidus auri*. *Peritus belli*. *Ignarus omnium*. *Memor præteriti*. *Reus furti*. *Tenax propositi*. *Tempus edax rerum*.

Adjectives called nouns partitive, because they signify part of some whole quantity or number, govern the word that signifieth the thing parted or divided, in the genitive; as *Aliquis nostrum*. *Primus omnium*. *Aurium mollior est sinistra*. *Oratorum eloquentissimus*. And oft in the neuter gender; as *Multum lucri*. *Id negotii*. *Hoc noctis*. Sometimes, though seldom, a word signifying the whole, is read in the same case with the partitive, as, *Habet duos gladios quibus altero te occisurum minatur, altero villicum*, Plaut. for *Quorum altero*. *Magnum opus habeo in manibus; quod jampridem ad hunc ipsum* (me

me autem dicebat) quædam institui. Cic. Acad. 1. Quod quædam for cujus quædam.

A Dative.

ADjectives that betoken profit or disprofit, likeness or unlikeness, fitness, pleasure, submitting, or belonging to any thing, require a dative; as Labor est utilis corpori. Equalis Hectori. Idoneus bello. Jucundus omnibus. Parenti supplex. Mihi proprium.

But such as betoken profit or disprofit have sometimes an accusative with a preposition; as Homo ad nullam partem utilis. Cic. Inter se æquales.

And some adjectives signifying likeness, unlikeness, or relation, may have a genitive. Par hujus. Ejus culpæ affines. Domini similis es. Commune animantium est conjunctionis appetitus. Alienum dignitatis ejus. Cic. Fin. 1. Fuit hoc quondam proprium populi Romani longè a domo bellare. But proprius and proximus admit sometimes an accusative; as proximus Pompeium fedebam. Cic.

An Accusative.

NOuns of measure are put after adjectives of like signification in the accusative, and sometimes in the ablative; as Turris alta centum pedes. Arbor lata tres digitos. Liber crassus tres pollices, or tribus pollicibus. Sometimes in the genitive; as Areas latas pedum denum facito.

All words expressing part or parts of a thing, may be put in the accusative, or sometimes in the ablative; as Saucius frontem or fronte. Excepto quòd non simul esses cætera lætus. Hor. Nuda pedem. Ov. Os humerosque deo similis. Virg. Sometimes in the genitive; as Dubius mentis.

An Ablative.

ADjectives of the comparative degree englished with this sign then or by, as dignus, indignus, præditus, contentus, and these words of price, carus, vilis, require an ablative; as Frigidior glacie. Multo doctior. Uno pede altior. Dignus

honore. Virtute præditus. Sorte sua contentus. Affe charum.

But of comparatives, plus, amplius, and minus, may govern a genitive; also a nominative, or an accusative; as Plus quinquaginta hominum. Amplius duorum millium. Ne plus tertia pars eximatur mellis. Varro. Paulo plus quingentos passus. Ut ex sua cujusque parte ne minus dimidium ad fratrem perveniret, Cic. Verr. 4. And dignus, indignus, have sometimes a genitive after them; as Militia est operis altera digna tui. Indignus avorum. Virg.

Adjectives betokening plenty or want, will have an ablative, and sometimes a genitive; as Vacuus ira, or iræ. Nulla epistola inanis re aliqua. Ditissimus agri. Stultorum plena sunt omnia. Integer vitæ, scelerisque purus. Expers omnium. Vobis immunibus hujus esse moli dabitur.

Words also betokening the cause, or form, or manner of a thing, are put after adjectives in the ablative case; as Pallidus ira. Trepidus morte futura. Nomine Grammaticus, re Barbarus.

Of Pronouns.

PRONouns differ not in construction from nouns, except that possession, Meus, tuus, suus, noster, vester, by a certain manner of speech, are sometimes joined to a substantive, which governs their primitive understood with a noun or participle in a genitive case; as Dico mea unius opera rempublicam esse liberatam, Cic. for Mei unius opera. In like manner Nostra duorum, trium, paucorum, omnium virtute, for nostrum duorum, &c. Meum solius peccatum, Cic. Ex tuo ipso animo, for Tui ipsius. Ex sua cujusque parte, Id. verr. 2. Ne tua quidem recentia proximi Prætoris vestigia persequi poterat. Cic. verr. 4. Si meas præsentis preces non putas profuisse, id. Pro Planc. Nostros vidisti flentis ocellos. Ovid.

Also a relative, as qui or is, sometimes answers to an antecedent noun or pronoun primitive understood in the possessive; as Omnes laudare fortunas meas qui filium haberem tali ingenio præditum. Terent.

Construction of Verbs.

VErbs for the most part govern either one case after them, or more than one in a different manner of construction.

Of the verb substantive *Sum*, and such like, with a nominative and other oblique cases.

VErbs that signify being, as *Sum*, *existo*, *fio*; and certain passives, as *dicor*, *vocor*, *salutor*, *appellor*, *habeor*, *existimor*, *videor*; also verbs of motion or rest, as *incedo*, *discedo*, *sedeo*, with such like, will have a nominative case after them, as they have before them, because both cases belong to the same person or thing, and the latter is rather in an apposition with the former, than governed by the verb; as *Temperantia est virtus*. *Horatius salutatur poeta*. *Ast ego quæ divum incedo regina*.

And if *est* be an impersonal, it may sometimes govern a genitive, as *Ufus poetæ*, *ut moris est*, *licentia*. *Phædrus* l. 4. *Negavit moris esse Græcorum ut &c.* *Cic. Verr.* 2.

But if the following noun be of another person, or not directly spoken of the former, both after *Sum* and all his compounds, except *possum*, it shall be put in the dative; as *Est mihi domi pater*. *Multa petentibus desunt multa*.

And if a thing be spoken of, relating to the person, it may be also in the dative; as *Sum tibi præsidio*. *Hæc res est mihi voluptati*. *Quorum alteri capioni cognomen fuit*. *Cic. Pastori nomen faustulo fuisse ferunt*. *Liv.*

Of verbs transitives with an accusative, and the exceptions thereto belonging.

VErbs active or deponent, called transitive, because their action passeth forth on some person or thing, will have an accusative after them of the person or thing to whom the action is done; as *Amo te*. *Vitium fuge*. *Deum venerare*. *Ufus promptos facit*. *Juyat me*. *Oportet te*.

Also verbs called neuters, may have an accusative of their own signification; as *Duram servit servitutum*. *Longam ire viam*. *Endymionis somnum dormis*. *Pastillos Rufillus olet*. *Nec vox hominem sonat*. *Cum glaucum saltasset*. *Paterc. Agit lætum convivam*. *Horat. Hoc me latet*.

But these verbs, though transitive, *Miseror* and *miserescor*, pass into a genitive; as *miserere mei*. Sometimes into a dative: *Huic misereor*. *Sen. Dilige bonos, miseresce malis*. *Boetius*.

Reminiscor, *obliviscor*, *recordor*, and *memini*, sometimes also require a Genitive; as *Data fidei reminiscitur*. *Memini tui*. *Obliviscor carminis*. Sometime retain the accusative; as *Recordor pueritiam*. *Omnia quæ curant senes meminere*. *Plaut.*

These impersonals also, *interest* and *refert*, signifying to concern, require a genitive, except in these ablatives feminine, *Mea*, *tua*, *sua*, *nostra*, *vestra*, *cuja*. And the measure of concernment is often added in these genitives, *magni*, *parvi*, *tanti*, *quantum*, with their compounds; as *Interest omnium rectè agere*. *Tua refert te ipsum nosse*. *Vestra parvi interest*.

But verbs of profiting or disprofiting, believing, pleasing, obeying, opposing, or being angry with, pass into a dative; as *non potes mihi commodare nec incommo-dare*. *Placeo omnibus*. *Crede mihi*. *Nimium ne crede colori*. *Pareo parentibus*. *Tibi repugno*. *Adolescenti nihil est quod succenseat*. But of the first and third sort, *Juvo*, *adjuvo*, *lædo*, *offendo*, retain an accusative.

Lastly, these transitives, *fungor*, *fruor*, *utor*, *potior*, and verbs betokening want, pass direct into an ablative. *Fungitur officio*. *Aliena frui insania*. *Utere sorte tua*. But *fungor*, *fruor*, *utor*, had anciently an accusative. Verbs of want, and *potior*, may have also a genitive. *Pecuniæ indiget*. *Quasi tu hujus indigeas patris*. *Potior urbe*, or *urbis*.

Sometimes a phrase of the same signification with a single verb, may have the case of the verb after it; as *Id operam do*, that is to say, *id ago*. *Idne estis authores mihi?* for *id suadetis*. *Quid me vobis tactio*

tactio est? for tangitis. Plaut. Quid tibi hanc curatio est rem? Id.

The Accusative with a Genitive.

Hitherto of transitives governing their accusative, or other case, in single and direct construction: now of such as may have after them more cases than one in construction direct and oblique, that is to say, with an accusative, a genitive, dative, other accusative, or ablative.

Verbs of esteeming, buying or selling, besides their accusative, will have a genitive betokening the value of price, flocci, nihili, pili, hujus, and the like after verbs of esteeming: Tanti, quanti, pluris, minoris, and such like, put without a substantive, after verbs of buying or selling; as Non hujus te aestimo. Ego illum flocci pendo. Aequi boni hoc facio or consulo. Quanti mercatus es hunc equum? Pluris quam vellem.

But the word of value is sometimes in the ablative; as Parvi or parvo aestimas probitatem. And the word of price most usually; as Teruncio eum non emerim. And particularly in these adjectives, Vili, paulo, minimo, magno, nimio, plurimo, duplo, put without a substantive, as Vili, vendo triticum. Redimite captum quam queas minimo. And sometimes minore for minoris. Nam a Caelio propinqui minore centessimis nummum movere non possunt. Cic. Att. l. i. But verbs neuter or passive have only the oblique cases after them; as Tanti eris aliis, quanti tibi fueris. Pudor parvi penditur. Which is also to be observed in the following rules.

And this neuter valeo governeth the word of value in the accusative; as Denarii dicti quod denos æris valebant. Varr.

Verbs of admonishing, accusing, condemning, acquitting, will have, besides their accusative, a genitive of the crime, or penalty, or thing; as Admonuit me errati. Accusas me furti? Vatem sceleris damnat. Furem dupli condemnavit. And sometimes an ablative with a preposition, or without; as Condemnabo eodem ego te crimine. Accusas furti, an stupri, an utro-

que? De repetundis accusavit, or damnavit. Cic.

Also these impersonals, poenitet, tædet, miseret, miserescit, pudet, piget, to their accusative will have a genitive, either of the person, or of the thing; as Nostri nosmet poenitet. Urbis me tædet. Pudet me negligentiae.

An Accusative with a Dative.

Verbs of giving or restoring, promising or paying, commanding or shewing, trusting or threatening, add to their accusative a dative of the person; as Fortuna multis nimium dedit. Hæc tibi promitto. Aes alienum mihi numeravit. Frumentum imperat civitatibus. Quod & cui dicas, videto. Hoc tibi suadeo. Tibi or ad te scribo. Pecuniam omnem tibi credo. Utrique mortem minatus est.

To these add verbs active compounded with these prepositions, præ, ad, ab, con, de, ex, ante, sub, post, ob, in and inter; as Præcipio hoc tibi. Admovit urbi exercitum. Collegæ suo imperium abrogavit. Sic parvis componere magna solebam.

Neuters have a dative only; as Meis majoribus virtute preluxi. But some compounded with præ and ante may have an accusative; as Præstat ingenio alius alium. Multos anteit sapientia. Others with a preposition; as Quæ ad ventris victum conducunt. In hæc studia incumbite. Cic.

Also all verbs active, betokening acquisition, likening or relation, commonly Englished with to or for, have to their accusative a dative of the person; as Magnam laudem sibi peperit. Huic habeo non tibi. Se illis æquarunt. Expedi mihi hoc negotium: but mihi tibi sibi, sometimes are added for elegance, the sense not requiring; as Suo hunc sibi jugulat gladio. Terent. Neuters a dative only; as Non omnibus dormio. Libet mihi. Tibi licet.

Sometimes a verb transitive will have to his accusative a double dative, one of the person, another of the thing; as De tibi vestem pignori. Verto hoc tibi vitio. Hoc tu tibi laudi duces.

A double Accusative.

Verbs of asking, teaching, arraying, and concealing, will have two accusatives, one of the person, another of the thing; as *Rogo te pecuniam. Doceo te literas. Quod te jamdudum hortor. Induit se calceos. Hoc me celabas.*

And being passives, they retain one accusative of the thing, as *Sumtumque re-tingitur anguem. Ovid. Met. 4. Induitur togam. Mart.*

But verbs of arraying sometimes change the one accusative into an ablative or dative; as *Induo te tunica, or tibi tunicam. Instravit equum penula, or equo penulam.*

An Accusative with an Ablative.

Verbs transitive may have to their accusative an ablative of the instrument or cause, matter, or manner of doing; and neuters the ablative only; as *Ferit eum gladio. Taceo metu. Malis gaudet alienis. Summa eloquentia causam egit. Capitolium saxo quadrato substructum est. Tuo consilio nitor. Vescor pane. Affluis opibus. Amore abundas. Sometimes with a preposition of the manner; as Summa cum humanitate me tractavit.*

Verbs of endowing, imparting, depriving, discharging, filling, emptying, and the like, will have an ablative, and sometimes a genitive; as *Dono te hoc annulo. Plurima salute te impertit. Aliquem familiarem suo sermone participavit. Paternum servum sui participavit consilii. Interdico tibi aqua & igni. Libero te hoc metu. Implentur veteris Bacchi.*

Also verbs of comparing or exceeding, will have an ablative of the excess; as *Præfero hunc multis gradibus. Magno intervallo eum superat.*

After all manner of verbs, the word signifying any part of a thing, may be put in the genitive, accusative or ablative; as *Abfurde facis qui angas te animi. Pendet animi. Discrucior animi. Desipit mentis. Candet dentes. Rubet capillos. Ægrotat animo, magis quam corpore.*

Nouns of Time and Place after Verbs.

Nouns betokening part of time, be put after verbs in the ablative and sometimes in the accusative; as *Nocte vigilas, luce dormis. Nullam partem noctis requiescit. Cic. Abhinc triennium ex Andro commigravit. Ter. Respondit triduo illum, ad summum quatruiduo periturum. Cic. Or if continuance of time, in the accusative, sometimes in the ablative; as *Sexaginta annos natus. Hyemem totam stertis. Imperium deponere maluerunt, quam id tenere punctum temporis contra religionem. Cic. Imperavit triennio, & decem mensibus. Suet. Sometimes with a preposition; as *Ferè in diebus paucis, quibus hæc acta sunt. Ter. Rarely with a genitive; as *Temporis angusti mansit concordia discors. Lucan.****

Also nouns betokening space between places are put in the accusative, and sometimes in the ablative; as *Pedem hinc ne discefferis. Abest ab urbe quingentis millibus passuum. Terra marique gentibus imperavit.*

Nouns that signify place, and also proper names of greater places, as countries, be put after verbs of moving or remaining, with a preposition, signifying to, from, in, or by, in such case as the preposition requireth; as *Proficiscor ab urbe. Vivit in Anglia. Veni per Galliam in Italiam.*

But if it be the proper name of a lesser place, as of a city, town, or lesser island, or any of these four, *Humus, domus, militia, bellum*, with these signs, *on, in or at* before them, being of the first or second declension, and singular number, they shall be put in the genitive; if of the third declension, or plural number, or this word *rus*, in the dative or ablative; as *Vixit Romæ, Londini. Ea habitabat Rhodi. Conon plurimum Cypri vixit. Cor. Nep. Procumbit humi bos. Domi bellicque simul viximus. Militavit Carthagini or Carthagine. Studuit Athenis. Ruri or rure educatus est.*

If the verb of moving be to a place, it shall be put in the accusative; as *Eo Romam, domum, rus*. If from a place, in the ablative; as *Discessit Londino. Abiit domo. Rure est reversus*.

Sometimes with a preposition; as *A Brundisio profectus est, Cic. Manil. Ut ab Athenis in Bœotiam irem. Sulpit. apud Cic. Fam. l. 4. Cum te profectum ab domo scirem. Liv. l. 8.*

Construction of Passives.

A Verb passive will have after it an ablative of the doer, with the preposition *a* or *ab* before it, sometimes without, and more often a dative: as *Virgilius legitur a me. Fortes creantur fortibus. Hor. Tibi fama petatur. And neutro-passives, as Vapulo, veneo, liceo, exulo, fio, may have the same construction; as ab hoste venire.*

Sometimes an accusative of the thing is found after a passive; as *Coronari Olympia. Hor. Epist. 1. Cyclopa movetur. Hor. for saltat or egit. Purgor bilem. Id.*

Construction of Gerunds and Supines.

Gerunds and supines will have such cases as the verb from whence they come; as *Otium scribendi literas. Eo auditum poetas. Ad consulendum tibi.*

A gerund in *di* is commonly governed both of substantives and adjectives in manner of a genitive; as *causa videndi. Amor habendi. Cupidus visendi. Certus eundi. And sometimes governeth a genitive plural; as illorum videndi gratia. Ter.*

Gerunds in *do* are used after verbs in manner of an ablative, according to former rules, with or without a preposition; as *Defessus sum ambulando. A discendo facile deterretur. Cæsar dando, sublevando, ignoscendo, gloriam adeptus est. In apparando consumunt diem.*

A gerund in *dum* is used in manner of an accusative after prepositions governing that case; as *Ad capiendum hostes. Ante domandum ingentes tollent animos. Virg. Ob redimendum captivos. Inter cœnandum.*

Gerunds in signification are oft-times used as participles in *du*; *Tuorum confi-*

liorum, reprimendorum causa. Cic. Orationem Latinam legendis nostris efficies pleniorum. Cic. Ad accusandos homines præmio ducitur.

A gerund in *dum* joined with the impersonal *est*, and implying some necessity or duty to do a thing, may have both the active and passive construction of the verb from whence it is derived; as *Utendum est ætate. Ov. Pacem Trojano a rege petendum. Virg. Iterandum eadem ista mihi. Cic. Serviendum est mihi amicis. Plura dixi quam dicendum fuit. Cic. pro Sest.*

Construction of verb with verb.

When two verbs come together without a nominative case between them, the latter shall be in the infinitive mood; as *Cupio discere. Or in the first supine after verbs of moving; as Eo cubitum, spectatum. Or in the latter with an adjective; as Turpe est dictu. Facile factu, opus scitu.*

But if a case come between, not governed of the former verb, it shall always be an accusative before the infinitive mood; as *Te rediisse incolumem gaudeo. Malo me divitem esse, quam haberi.*

And this infinitive *esse*, will have always after it an accusative, or the same case which the former verb governs; as *Expedi bonos esse vobis. Quo mihi commissio, non licet esse piam. But this accusative agreeth with another understood before the infinitive; as Expedit vobis vos esse bonos. Natura beatis omnibus esse dedit. Nobis non licet esse tam disertis. The same construction may be used after other infinitives neuter or passive like to *esse* in signification; as *Maximo tibi postea & civi, & duci evadere contigit. Val. Max. l. 6.**

Sometimes a noun adjective or substantive governs an infinitive; as *audax omnia perpeti. Dignus amari. Consilium ceperunt ex oppido profugere. Cæs. Minari divisoribus ratio non erat. Cic. verr. 1.*

Sometimes the infinitive is put absolute for the preterimperfect or preterperfect tense; as *ego illud sedulo negare factum. Ter. Galba autem multas similitudines afferre. Cic. Ille contra hæc omnia ruere, agere vitam. Ter.*

Con-

Construction of Participles.

Participles govern such cases as the verb from whence they come, according to their active or passive signification; as *Fruiturus amicis. Nunquam audita mihi. Diligendus ab omnibus. Sate sanguine divum. Telamone creatus. Corpore mortali cretus, Lucret. Nate deâ. Edite regibus. Lævo suspensi oculos tabulasque lacerto. Hor. Censu equestrem summam. Id. Abeundem est mihi. Venus orta mari. Exosus Bella. Virg. Exosus diis. Gell. Arma perosus. Ovid. But Pertæsus hath an accusative otherwise than the verb; as *Pertæsus ignaviam. Semet ipse pertæsus. Suet.* To these add participial adjectives ending in *bilis* of the passive signification, and requiring like case after them; as *Nulli penetrabilis astro lucus erat.**

Participles changed into adjectives have their construction by the rules of adjectives, as *Appetens vini. Fugitans litum. Fidens animi.*

An Ablative put absolute.

TWO Nouns together, or a noun and pronoun with a participle expressed or understood, put absolutely, that is to say, neither governing nor governed of a verb, shall be put in the ablative; as *Authore senatu bellum geritur. Me duce vinces. Cæsare veniente hostes fugerunt. Sublato clamore prælium committitur.*

Construction of Adverbs.

EN and *ecce* will have a nominative, or an accusative, and sometimes with a dative; *En Priamus. Ecce tibi status noster. En habitum. Ecce autem alterum.*

Adverbs of quantity, time, and place require a genitive; as *Satis loquentiæ, sapientiæ parum satis.* Also compounded with a verb; as *Is rerum suarum satagit. Tunc temporis ubique gentium. Eo impudentiæ processit. Quoad ejus fieri poterit.*

To these add *Ergo* signifying the cause; as *Illius ergo. Virg. Virtutis ergo. Fugæ atque formidinis ergo non abiturus. Liv.*

Others will have such cases as the nouns from whence they come; as *Minime gen-*

tium. Optime omnium. Venit obviam illi. Canit similiter huic. Albanum, sive Falernum te magis oppositis delectat. Hor.

Adverbs are joined in a sentence to several moods of verbs.

Of time. *Ubi, postquam, cum* or *quum*, to an indicative or subjunctive; as *Hæc ubi dicta dedit. Ubi nos laverimus. Postquam excessit ex Ephebis. Cum faciam vitula. Virg. Cum canerem reges. Id.*

Donec while, to an Indicative. *Donec eris sælix. Donec* until, to an indicative or subjunctive; *Cogere donec oves jussit. Virg. Donec ea aqua decocta sit. Colum.*

Dum while, to an indicative. *Dum* apparatus virgo. *Dum* until, to an indicative or subjunctive; as *Dum redeo. Tertia dum Latio regnantem viderit æstas. Dum* for *dummodo* so as, or so that, to a subjunctive; *Dum* prosum tibi.

Quoad while, to an indicative. *Quoad* expectas contubernalem. *Quoad* until, to a subjunctive. *Omnia integra servabo, quoad exercitus huc mittatur.*

Simulac, simulatque to an indicative or subjunctive; as *Simulac belli patiens erat, simulatque adoleverit ætas.*

Ut as, to the same moods. *Ut saluta-bis, ita resalutaberis. Ut sementem feceris, ita & metos. Hor. Ut* so soon as, to an indicative only: as *Ut ventum est in urbem.*

Quasi, tanquam, perinde, ac si, to a subjunctive only; as *Quasi non norimus nos inter nos. Tanquam feceris ipse aliquid.*

Ne of forbidding, to an imperative or subjunctive; as *Ne sævi. Ne metuas.*

Certain adverbs of quantity, quality or cause; as *Quam, quoties, cur, quare, &c.* Thence also *qui, quis, quantus, qualis*, and the like, coming into a sentence after the principal verb, govern the verb following in a subjunctive; as *Videte quàm valdè malitiæ suæ confidat. Cic. Quid est cur tu in isto loco sedeas? Cic. pro Cluent. Subsideo mihi diligentiam comparavi quæ quanta sit intelligi non potest, nisi, &c. Cic. pro Quint. Nam quid hoc iniquius dici potest. Quam me qui caput alterius fortunæ defendam, Priore loco discere. Ibid. Nullum est officium tam sanctum atque solenne, quod non avaritia violare soleat. Ibid. Non me fallit, si consulamini quid*

quid sitis responsuri. Ibid. Dicit vix potest quam multa sint quæ respondeatis ante fieri oportere. Ibid. Docui quo die hunc sibi promississe dicat, eo die ne Romæ quidem eum fuisse. Ibid. Conturbatus discedit neque mirum cui hæc optio tam misera daretur. Ibid. Narrat quo in loco viderit Quintium. Ibid. Recte majores eum qui socium fefellisset in virorum bonorum numero non putarunt haberi oportere. Cic. pro Rosc. Am. Quæ concursatio percontantium quid Prætor edixisset, ubi cœnaret, quid enuntiasset. Cic. Agrar. I.

Of Conjunctions.

Conjunctions copulative and disjunctive, and these four, Quam, nisi, præterquam, an, couple like cases; as Socrates docuit Xenophontem & Platonem. Aut dies est, aut nox. Nescio albus an ater sit. Est minor natu quàm tu. Nemini placet præterquam sibi.

Except when some particular construction requireth otherwise; as Studui Romæ & Athenis. Emi fundum centum nummis & pluris. Accusas furti, an stupri, an utroque?

They also couple for the most part like moods and tenses, as Recto stat corpore, despicitque terras. But not always like tenses; as Nisi me lactasses, & vana spe produceres. Et habetur, & referetur tibi a me gratia.

Of other conjunctions, some govern an indicative, some a subjunctive, according to their several significations.

Etsi, tametsi, etiamsi, quanquam an indicative; quamvis and licet most commonly a subjunctive; as Etsi nihil novi afferebatur. Quanquam aninus meminisse horret. Quamvis Elysios miretur Græcia campos. Ipse licet venias.

Ni, nisi, si, siquidem, quod, quia, postquam, posteaquam, antequam, priusquam, an Indicative or subjunctive; as Nisi vi MAVIS eripi. Ni faciat. Castigo te, non quòd odeo habeam, sed quòd amem. Antequam dicam. Si for quamvis a subjunctive only. Redeam? Non si me obsecret.

Si also conditional may sometimes govern both verbs of the sentence in a subjunctive; as Respiraro si te videro. Cic. ad Attic.

Quando, quandoquidem, quoniam an indicative; as Dicite quandoquidem in molli confedimus herba. Quoniam convenimus ambo.

Cum, seeing that, a subjunctive; as Cum sis officiis Grædive virilibus aptus.

Ne, an, num, of doubting, a subjunctive; as Nihil refert, fecerisne, an persuaseris. Vise num redierit.

Interrogatives also of disdain or reproach understood, govern a subjunctive; as tantum dem, quantum ille poposcerit? Cic. verr. 4. Sylvam tu scantiam vendas? Cic. Agrar. Hunc tu non ames? Cic. ad Attic. Furem aliquem aut rapacem accusaris? Vitanda semper erit omnis avaritiæ suspicio. Cic. ver. 4. Sometimes an infinitive; as Méne incepto desistere victam? Virg.

Ut that, lest not, or although, a subjunctive; as Te oro, ut redeat jam in viam. Metuo ut substat hospes. Ut omnia contingat quæ volo.

Of Prepositions.

OF Prepositions, some will have an accusative after them, some an ablative, some both, according to their different signification.

An accusative these following, Ad, apud, ante, adversus adversum, cis citra, circum circa, circiter, contra, erga, extra, inter, intra, infra, juxta, ob, ponè, per, propè, propter, post, penes, præter, secundum, supra, secùs, trans, ultra, usque, versus: But versus is most commonly set after the case it governs, as Londinum versus.

And for an accusative after ad, a dative sometimes is used in poets; as It clamor coelo. Virg. Coelo si gloria tollit Æneadum. Sil. for ad coelum.

An ablative these, A, ab, abs, absque, cum, coram, de, e, ex, pro, præ, palàm, sine, tenus, which last is also put after his case, being most usually a genitive, if it be plural; as Capulo tenus. Aurium tenus.

These, both cases, In, sub, super, subter, clam, procul.

In, signifying to, towards, into, or against, requires an accusative; as Pisces emptos obolo in cœnam feni. Animus in Teucros benignus. Versa est in cineres Troja. In te committere tantum quid Troes

Troes potuere? Lastly, when it signifies future time, or for; as *Bellum in trigesimum diem indixerunt. Designati consules in annum sequentem.* *pi faciunt in singula capita canum.* *...* otherwise in will have an ablative; as *In Urbe. In Terris.*

Sub, when it signifies to, or in time, about, or a little before, requires an accusative; as *sub umbram properemus. Sub id tempus. Sub noctem.* Otherwise an ablative. *Sub pedibus. Sub umbra.*

Super signifying beyond, or present time, an accusative; as *Super Garamantas & Indos. Super coenam. Suet. at supper-time.* Of or concerning an ablative; as *Multa super Priamo rogans. Super hac re.*

Super, over or upon, may have either case; as *Super ripas Tiberis effusus. Sæva sedens super arma. Fronde super viridi.*

So also may subter; as *pugnatum est super subterque terras. Subter densa testudine. Virg. Clam patrem or patre. Procul muros. Liv. Patria procul.*

Prepositions in composition govern the same cases as before in apposition. *Adibo hominem. Detrudunt naves scopulo.* And the preposition is sometimes repeated; as *Detrahere de tua fama nunquam cogitavi.*

And sometimes understood, governeth his usual case; as *Habeo te loco parentis. Apparuit humana specie. Cumis erant oriundi. Liv. Liberis parentibus oriundis. Colum. Mutat quadrata rotundis. Hor. Pridie compitalia. Pridie nonas or calendas. Postridie idus. Postridie ludos.* Before which accusatives ante or post is to be understood, *Filii id ætatis. Cic. Hoc noctis. Liv. Understand Secundum.* Or refer to part of time, *Omnia mercurio similis. Virg. Understand per.*

Of Interjections.

Certain interjections have several cases after them. O, a nominative, accusative or vocative; as *O festus dies hominis. O ego lævus. Hor. O fortunatos. O formosæ puer.*

Others a nominative or an accusative; as *Heu prisca fides! Heu stirpem invisam! Proh sancte Jupiter! Proh deum atque hominum fidem! Hem tibi Davum!*

Yea, though the interjection be understood; as *Me miserum! Me cœcum, qui hæc ante non viderim!*

Others will have a dative; as *Hei mihi. Væ misero mihi. Terent.*

The End of the FIRST VOLUME.

ALA
V.1
O

The End of the First Volume



Milton, John, 1608-1674

The Works Of John Milton Historical, Political, and Miscellaneous. Now more correctly printed from the Originals, than in any former Edition, and many Passages restored, which have been hitherto omitted. To which is prefixed, An Account Of His Life And Writings. In Two Volumes
Bd.: 1.

London (1753)

4 P.o.angl. 9-4

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10686281-5